INDIA.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1896.

VOL. VII. NEW SERIES.

London:
PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

1896.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY A. BONNER,
1 & 2 TOOK'S COURT, E.C.

INDEX.

"A Masterpiece of Melancholy Meanness," 241.
"A Means of Learning Something," 61.
"A Very Silly Motion," 194.
Aberdeen Election, The North, 163.
Aberigh-Mackay, Mr. G., *Twenty-One Days in India*, 29.
Abolition of Trial by Jury, The, by A. Nundy, 107.
Address, The President's, 50.
Addresses, Congress, 115.
Adjustment, Hand-to-Mouth, by Sir J. B. Phear, 297.
Administration of Justice in India, The, by J. Dacosta, 263.
Afghans, Fresh Complications with the, by J. Dacosta, 301.
Africa, British Subjects in South, 6.
Aggression, The Cost of, 98.
Agreement, A Blundering, 132.
Agriculture, Sanitation and, 227.
"Aims of the Congress," 70.
Alibag Revision Settlement, The, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 262 (also 3).
"All Members for India"!, 110.
"An Inconvenient Opportunity," 2.
Anglo-Indian Criminal Cases, 307.
Anson, Brevet-Major O. H. S. G., *With Her Majesty's Lancers During the Indian Mutiny*, 26.
Arbitration, The Proposed Court of, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., 231.
Armenia, India and, 289.
Armies, Lord Wolseley and the British and Indian, 266.
Army in India, Venereal Disease in the European, by Prof. Stuart, M.P., 135.
Arnold, Sir Edwin, "East and West," 210.

Baba Log, The, 302.
Bagehot, W., "Physics and Politics," 243.
Balance, A Crushing Adverse, 7.
Banerji, Mr. Surendra Nath, on Indian Finance, 33.
Betrayal of Kafiristan, The, by an Ex-Diplomatist, 11 (see also 356, 7).
Bibliography, 32, 64, 96, 128, 160, 192, 224, 240, 288, 320, 352, 384.
Bill, India pays the, 101.
Blunder, The Chitral, 87.
Bombay Provincial Budget, 291; Speech by Lord Sandhurst on, 315.
Bonner, H. Bradlaugh—*Charles Bradlaugh: a Record of His Life and Work*, 126.
Bonnerjee, Mr. W. C., 280.
Bradlaugh, Charles, 126.
British Empire League, The, by J. Dacosta, 139; British Opinion on Indian Affairs, 13; British Subjects in South Africa, 6.
Bose, P. N., "History of Hindu Civilisation," 148; Prof. J. C. Bose, 380.
Browning's Poems, Robert, 368.
Buddhist Sacred Books of the, 117.
Budget, The Indian, 97, 124, 129; What Indian Critics Think, 141, 225; and the Queen's Speech, 257; Debate, Opinions of the Press, 270; Debate, Official Record, 281; Lord G. Hamilton's Optimism, 273; Analysis of the Voting Lists, 279; The Indian Budget, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 134; Another Look at the Indian Budget, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 167; The Indian Budget Farce, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., 295.
Budget, Bombay Provincial, 291; Speech by Lord Sandhurst on, 315.
Bureaucrat can do no Wrong, The, 3.
Bureaucratic "Aloofness," 35.
Burman, About the, 160.

Candour of the *Englishman*, 259.
Cannan, E., *Justice, Police, Revenue, and Arms*, by Adam Smith, 349.
Challenge from Madras, A, 54.
Chamberlain, Sir Neville, on the Invasion of Kafiristan, 118.
Chitral Amendment, The, 66; Danger Ahead in, 67; Amendment, The Nescience of Lord G. Hamilton, 82; Debate, Division List, 87; "The Chitral Blunder," 87; Papers, 131 (see also 357).
Chorus of Approval, A, 70.
Civil Service, Indians and the, 290; Successful Candidates in Examination for, 290, 346; Important Correspondence, 312.
Cobden, Morley's Life of, 294.
Colomb, Wit and Wisdom of Sir John, 193.
"Come Over and Help Us," 99.
Commission, Lord Welby's, 162, 240, 354, 355, 370; Evidence of Lord Wolseley and Lord Cromer, 282; Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Lord Wolseley, 313, 337.
Committee, The Indian Parliamentary, 98, 133.
Compensation Allowance, Exchange, 259; Compensation an Increase of Salary, 260.
Complications with the Afghans, Fresh, by J. Dacosta, 301.
Conference of Indians in England, 16.
Conference, The Social, 52.
Congress, The Eleventh, 7, 17; (Telegraphic Report), 16, 33, 49, 57, (Text of Resolutions at), 58; "A Means of Learning Something," 61; Aims of the, 70; and the Anglo-Indian Press, 80; Addresses, 115; Resolutions of the, 126; The Coming Congress, by A. O. Hume, C.B., 360.
"Continuous" Policy, A, 36.
Correspondence, 80.
Cost of Solvency to India, 154.
Cotton Duties, Tories and the, 4, 14; Lord G. Hamilton on the, 24, 26, 36, 99, 119, 133, 161, 162; Memorial to Lord G. Hamilton, etc., 186, 229; The Cotton Duties and the Indian Poor, 166; The Cotton Duties, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 198; Cotton Industry in India, The, 347.
Couch, Sir Richard, on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 40.
Councils, Wanted: Reform of the, 43.
Criminal Law of India, 318; Anglo-Indian Criminal Cases, 307; *Indian Criminal Law*, 222.
Crisis, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on the, 62.

Dacosta, J., on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 10; The British Empire League, 139; The Moplahs and the Land Tax in India, 168; Indian Troops for the Sudan, 200; Injustice to India, 233; The Administration of Justice in India, 263; Fresh Complications with the Afghans, 301; Sir C. Elliott on the Defensive, 341.
Debate, Budget: Opinions of the Press, 270; Official Record, 281.
Deccan, The History of The, 92.
Detective as Judge, The, 209.
"Determined Optimism," 164.
"*Ditticisms*," 20.
Division List, The Chitral Debate, 87.
Drafts, The Secretary of State's, by W. M. W., 76.
Duncan, Sara J., *His Honor and the Lady*, 350.
Duty of the Liberal Party Towards India, The, by A. G. Symonds, M.A., 136.
Duties, Tories and the Cotton, 4, 14; Lord G. Hamilton on the, 24, 36, 99, 119, 133, 161, 162; Memorial to Lord G. Hamilton, etc., 186, 229; and the Indian Poor, 166; by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 198.

East India Association, Paper on The Indian National Congress, 70.
Eckenstein, Oscar, *The Karakorums and Kashmir*, 286.
Educated India, Task of, 35; Duty of, Speech by Mr. P. M. Mehta, 46.
Education at High Pressure, 203.
Egerton of Tatton, The Right Hon., M.A., etc., *Indian and Oriental Armour*, 189.
Elgin, Refutes himself, Lord, 2; at Madras, 45.
Elliott, Sir C., The Indiscretion of, by A. Nundy, 12; Help from Sir C., 321; Judicial and Executive Duties in India, 326; on the Defensive, by J. Dacosta, 341.
England, France, and Siam, 39.
English Ignorance of India, by an Independent Politician, 109.
Examinations, Simultaneous, Petitions to Parliament, 126.
Examinations, Results of Indian Civil Service, 290, 346.
Exchange Compensation Allowance, 259, 376.
Executive in India, The Judiciary and

the, 1, 8, 13, 39, 40, 41, 68; Memorial by the British Committee, 90, 112; Duties in India, Judicial and, 326; Functions in India, Judicial and, by A. Nundy, 74, 258, 259.
Expenditure, Indian Revenue and, by W. M. J. Williams, 201; Indian Military, by D. E. Wacha, 151; Growth of Indian, 344; Wanted: Checks on, 370.
Exports, Excess of Indian, 197.
Explanation, A Handsome, 5.

Facts and Figures, 259.
Famine, Insurance Fund, 129; The Expected, 356, 361, 364, 365, 369, 376-80.
Finance, Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji on, 33; Commission, 37; Proposed Parliamentary Committee on Indian, 345.
Financial Outlook, The, 5; Peril, 212.
Fletcher, A. E., on the Jingo Revival, 71.
"Flotsam," 261.
Foreign Policy, India and, 321.
"Forward" Policy in Practice, 132; A Blundering Agreement, 155, 324.
Fowler, Sir H., at Wolverhampton, 69; Magnanimity of, 162.
Fraser, Mr. R. W., LL.B., I.C.S., *Silent Gods and Sun-Steeped Lands*, 29.
"Frontier" Scare, Another, 195.
Frontiers and Finance, by an Independent Politician, 170.

Garth, Sir Richard, on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 8.
Gondal, Twelve Months in, 293.
Ghose, Mr. Manomohan, 353, 363.
Good Reading about Many Books, Mostly by their Authors, 159.
Greek Lyric Poets, The, 372.
Green, Col. A. O., R.E., *A Practical Hindustani Grammar*, 192.
Gribble, J. D. B., *A History of the Deccan*, 92.
Growth of Indian Expenditure, 344.
Gujarati Grammar, A, 64.

Hamilton, Lord G., on the Cotton Duties, 24; Discomfiture of, 66; The Nescience of, 82; Defence of, 179; Optimism of, 273.
Health Missioners for Rural India, by Miss Florence Nightingale, 359, 367.
Hindu at Home, The, 191.
Hindustani Grammar, A, 192.
"*His Honor and a Lady*," 350.
History of Hindu Civilisation under British Rule, by P. N. Bose, 148.
History of the Transvaal, The, 205.
Hobhouse, Lord, on Indian Affairs, 22; on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 39.
Holden, Edward S., LL.D., *The Mogul Emperors of Hindustan*, 18.
Home Charges, The, 34.
How not to Argue, 195.
How it Strikes an Indian, 130.
Hume, A. O., C.B., Looking Backwards, 104; The Coming Congress, 360.

Ideals, Indian, 207.
Ignorance of India, English, by an Independent Politician, 109.
Ind, Tales of, 358.
India in the British Parliament, 174; 1896, 305; and British Parties, 195; and the Transvaal, 220; The Systematic Plunder of, 318; *Ancient India*, 319; Poor India Pays, 325; India the Keystone, 323; *India, Representative Men of Southern*, 223.
Indian Stories, 29.
Indiana, 1, 33, 65, 97, 129, 161, 193, 225, 257, 289, 321, 353.
Industry in India, The Cotton, 347.
Injustice to India, by J. Dacosta, 233.
Intellectual India, 148.
Invasion of Kafiristan, The, 118.

James's, Lord, Reply to Sir H. James, 26.
Jhalawar Case, The, 88, 100, 226.
Jingo Revival, The, by A. E. Fletcher, 71.
Judge, The Detective as, 209,
Judicial and Executive Duties in India: Sir C. Elliott's "Apologia," 326; Functions in India, by A. Nundy, 74, 258, 259 (see also under "Judiciary and Executive"; Murison, A. F.; Phear, Sir J. B.; Reynolds, H. J.; Dacosta, J.; Elliott, Sir C.; Reid, Sir R. T.).
Judiciary and the Executive, The, 1, 8, 13, 39, 68; Memorandum by the British Committee, 90; Speech of Manomohan Ghose, 112.
Jungle-Book, The Second, 30.
Jurisprudence, A First Book of, 383.
Jury, The Abolition of Trial by, by A. Nundy, 107.
Justice in India, The Administration of, by J. Dacosta, 263.

Kafiristan, The Betrayal of, by an Ex-Diplomatist, 11; The Invasion of, 118.
Karkaria, R. P., *India, Forty Years of Progress and Reform*, 284.
Karakoram Himalayas, The, 286.
Kashmir, The Valley of, 94.
Keystone, India the, 323.
Kipling, Rudyard, *The Second Jungle-Book*, 30.

Lancashire, Our Opportunity in, 4.
Land Revenue, Assessment in Madras, by Alex. Rogers, 105, 137; Land Revenue in Madras, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 299; Land Tax in India, The Moplahs and the, by J. Dacosta, 168.
Landlordism in Madras, State, 180.
Law of India, Criminal, 318.
Lawrence, W. R., I.C.S., C.I.E., *The Valley of Kashmir*, 94.
Leadership, The Liberal, 338.
Legacy of Permanent Expenditure, A, 129.
Legislation, "Hole and Corner," 230.
London Letter, Our, 21, 55, 85, 123, 150, 175, 213, 238, 279, 303, 336, 374.
Looking Backwards, by A. O. Hume, C.B., 104.
Lore, Buddhist, 117.
"Loss by Exchange," The Enigma of, by Sir J. B. Phear, 102.
Lyric Poets, The Greek, 372.

M'Crindle, J. W., M.A., M.R.A.S., F.R.S.G.S., *Ancient India, Its Invasion by Alexander the Great*, 319.
Madras, Lord Elgin at, 45; A Challenge from, 54; Land Revenue Assessment in, by Alex. Rogers, 105, 137; by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 299; Forty Years Progress of, 113.
Madras Presidency College, Publications of, 54.
Magistrates on Tour, by A. Nundy, 172.
Mahârâjâ of Jhalawar, 88, 100, 226.
Malabari, B. M., Sketch of the Life and Times of, 284.
"Mandate," Scope of the, 121.
Maxims from Lord Rosebery, Some, 163.
Mayne, J. D., *The Criminal Law of India*, 222.
Mead, G. R. S., B.A., M.R.A.S., and Jagadisha Chandra Chatto-padhyaya, *The Upanishads*, 190.
Mehta's, Mr., Speech, 34; On the Duty of Educated India, 46.
Men of the South, 223.
Military Expenditure, Indian, by D. E. Wacha, 151.
Militarism, Plague of, 228.
"Missing Link," A., 324.
Mogul, The Great, 18.
Money and Movement of Prices, 181.
Moplahs and the Land Tax in India, The, by J. Dacosta, 168.
"Moral and Material Progress," 226.
Morris William, 309.
Müller, Prof. F. Max, Chips from a German Workshop, 28.
Murison, Prof. A. F., LL.D., on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 9; on the Indian Outlanders, 72; The Indian Budget, 134; Another Look at the Indian Budget, 167; The Cotton Duties, 198; The Alibag Revision Settlement, 262; Land Revenue in Madras, 299; Judicial and Executive Duties in India, 333.
Mutual Admiration, 258.
Myths and Folk-Lore, 28.

Naoroji, Mr. Dadabhai, on the Crisis, 62.
Nârâyana, Har, *The Vedic Philosophy; or an Exposition of the Sacred and Mysterious Monosyllable "Aum*," 286.
Natural Law in the Political World, 243.
"New" Diplomacy, The, 69.
Nightingale, Miss Florence, on Village Sanitation, 353, 359, 367.
Nundy, Mr. A., on the Indiscretions of Sir C. Elliott, 12; The Indian National Congress, 70; Judicial and Executive Functions in India, 74; The Abolition of Trial by Jury, 107; Magistrates on Tour, 172; An Opportunity for Revision, 268.

"Of Their Own Accord," 98.
Officers with Indian Regiments, English, 260; History of the Question, 261.
"Om," 286.
"Only a Little One," 6.
Opening of Parliament, The, 81.
Optimism, of Sir J. Westland, The, 130; of Lord G. Hamilton, 273.
Outlanders, The Indian, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 72.
Outlook Abroad, The, 38.

Padfield, The Rev. B. D., *The Hindu at Home, being Sketches of Hindu Daily Life*, 191.
Pai, N. W., B.A., LLB, *Stray Sketches in Chakmapore*, 157.
Parliament, India in the British, 174; 1896, 305; A Case for, 3; The Opening of, 81.
Parliamentary Committee, The Indian, 98, 133; on Indian Finance, Proposed, 345.
Pasteurism, Touting for, 294.
Pater's Last Work, Walter, 339.
Peril, The Financial, 212.
Phear, Sir J. B., on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 8; The Enigma of "Loss by Exchange", 102; Hand-to-Mouth Adjustment, 297; Judicial and Executive Duties in India, 330; The late Mr. Manomohan Ghose, 363.
Philosopher, A Complacent, 210.
Physics and Politics, by Walter Bagehot, 243.

Plunder of India, The Systematic, 318.
Policy, "Forward," The, in Practice, 132; A Blundering Agreement, 155; 324.
Political and Social Reform in India, 77; Political Science, 147; World, Natural Law in the, 243.
Poona Congress, The, 7, 16, 17, 33, 49, 57.
Poor, The Burden of the, 161; The Cotton Duties and the Indian, 166.
Power, The Real Motive, 113.
Predominant Partner, The, 177.
President's Address, The, 50.
Press, The Congress and the Anglo-Indian, 80; India in the British, 164.
Prices, Money and Movement of, 181.
Progress, Moral and Material, 226.
Publications, Recent Official, 32, 96, 160, 192, 224, 240, 288, 320, 352, 384.
Publicity, In Praise of, 37.

Q., Edited by, *The Story of the Sea*, 30.
Queen's Speech, India and the, 65.

Railway Exploitation, Indian, 264.
Railways in India: A Heavy Financial Loss, 84, 227.
Ranjitsinhji, Prince, 237, 316.
Ray, P. C., *The Poverty Problem in India*, 62.
Reactionary Enterprises—and After, 145.
Reay, Lord, and Lord Sandhurst, 36.
Record of Exhaustion, A, 227.
Reform in India, University, 208.
Reid, Sir Robert T., Q.C., M.P., on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 40.
Relief of Chitral," "The, 31.
Resolutions of Indian National Congress, Text of, 58, 126; of Ninth Social Conference, Text of, 91.
Revenue aud Expenditure, Indian, by W. M. J. Williams, 201.
Reviews, 26, 62, 92, 126, 157, 189, 222, 284, 319, 349, 382.
Revision Settlement, The Alibag, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 262; An Opportunity for, by A. Nundy, 268.
Reynolds, H. J., C.S.I., Judicial and Executive Functions in India, 326.
Rogers, Alexander, Land Revenue Assessment in Madras, 105, 137.
Rosebery, Some Maxims of Lord, 163.
Rural India, Health Missioners for, by Miss Florence Nightingale, 353, 359, 367.

Salt, Not even a Pinch of, 131.
Sandhurst, Lord, Lord Reay and, 36; Success of, 100; Budget Debate in Bombay: Speech by, 315.
Sanitation and Agriculture, 227; Village Sanitation, 353, 359, 367.
Science, Political, 147.
Scope of the "Mandate," The, 121.
Sea-borne Trade, India's, 6, 197.
Secretary of State's Drafts, by W. M. W., 76.
Seeley, Sir J. R., Introduction to Political Science, 147.
Self-Criticism, 159.
Service, Indians and the Civil, 290; Important Correspondence, 312; Civil Service of India, 346.
Simla's Nightmares, 196.
Simultaneous Examinations, 126; Wanted, 290.
Sketches by Pai, 157.
Smith, Adam, Lectures, 349.
Social Conference, The, 52; Text of Resolutions, The Ninth Conference, 91; *Social Reformer, A*, 284; Reform in India, Political and, 77.
Soldier of the Mutiny, A, 26.
Solvency to India, The Cost of, 154.
Sudan, Troops for the, 165; Indian Troops for the: Opinions of the Press, 182, 216; Indian Troops in the Sudan, by J. Dacosta, 200; Rumoured Second Thoughts, 214 (see also under "Suakin").
Specimen, "Moral Effect," A, 67.
Spectre, The Russian, 165, 196, 322.
State Landlordism in Madras, 180.
Story of the Sea, The, 30.
Stuart, Prof., M.P., Venereal Disease in the European Army in India, 135.
Suakin, Indian Troops at, Proposed Court of Arbitration, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., 231; Injustice to India, by J. Dacosta, 233; "A Masterpiece of Melancholy Meanness," 241; The Debate in the Commons, 245; In the Lords, 246; Summary of Parliamentary Papers, 247; Opinions of the Press, 254 (see also under "Sudan").
Symonds, A. G., M.A., The Duty of the Liberal Party towards India, 136.

Tales of Ind, 358.
Taylor, G. P., M.A., B.D., *The Students' Gujarati Grammar*, 64.
Tories and the Cotton Duties, 4, 14.
Transvaal, The History of the, 205; and India, The, 220.
Troops in India, British, 100; Troops for the Sudan, 165; Indian Troops for the Sudan: Opinions of the Press, 182, 216; Indian troops for the Sudan, by J. Dacosta, 200; The Borrowed, 225; Troops at Suakin, 245 (see also under "Sudan" and "Suakin").
"*Twenty-one Days in India*," 29.

Uitlanders, and India: The Mote and the Beam, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., 41, 68.
University Reform in India, 208.

Vedas, Theosophy of the, 190.
Vedic Philosophy, The, 286.
Venereal Disease in the European Army in India, by Prof. Stuart, M.P., 135.
Viceroy's Tour, The, 1.
Village Sanitation, 353, 359, 367.
Vivekananda in London, Swâmi, 235.

Wacha, D. E., on Indian Military Expenditure, 151.
Wanted: Effective Control, 38; Reform of the Councils, 43; Effective Scrutiny, 274.
War, The Spoils of, 189.
Wedderburn, Sir W., Bart., M.P., on Uitlanders and India, 41; The Cotton Duties and the Indian Poor, 166; The Proposed Court of Arbitration, 231; The Indian Budget Farce, 295; The Indian Famine, 379, 356.
Welby's, Lord, Commission, 162, 240, 854, 5, 370; Evidence of Lord Wolseley and Lord Cromer, 282; Mr. D. Naoroji and Lord Wolseley, 313, 337.
West, Sir Raymond, on the Judiciary and Executive in India, 41.
Westland, Optimism of Sir J., 130.
Williams, W. M. J., on Indian Revenue and Expenditure, 201.
Wilson, Dr. W. H., University Reform in India, 208.
Wit and Wisdom of Sir J. Colomb, The, 193.
Wolseley, Lord, and the British and Indian Armies, 266.
Wordsworth: His Present and Future Influence, 276.

Yoe, Shway, *The Burman, His Life and Notions*, 160.
Yoga, Râja, 278.
Younghusband, Captains G. J. and F. E., *The Relief of Chitral*, 31.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENT.

Abkari Department, The, 95.
Act, Bengal Tenancy, 97, 98; Madras Proprietary Village Service, 14, 31.
Address, Debate on, 1; Chitral and Siam, 2; Sir W. Wedderburn's Amendment, The Retention of Chitral, 5; Lord G. Hamilton's Reply to, 6.
Aden, Hospitals at, 22, 97; The Nursing Staff at, 80.
Afghanistan and the Kafirs, 3, 33.
Africa, British Indian Subjects in South, 4, 27; Indian Troops in, 80; Medal for Service in Central, 89.
African Wild Elephant, The, 58.
Agreement, The Siam, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 24, 53.
Agricultural Banks in Madras, 16.
Ammunition in India, 22; Alleged Illicit Trade in, 49.
Appeal Court of Bengal, 8.
Army, The Indian, 111; Disease in the, 23, 27, 32; Estimates, 17; Medical Department, 11; Pensions, 9, 14, 17, 18; Pension Deficiency, 34, 35; Service in India, 11; The "Cat" in the Indian, 16.
Arrest on a Haidarabad Railway, The, 51.
Assam, Coolies in, 33.

Bashgal Valley, The Story of the, 35.
Behar Opium Agency, The, 16.
Bengal, Appeal Court of, 8; Gaols, 95, 97; Tenancy Act, 97, 98.
Bimetallism, 18.
Bombay Small Cause Court, The, 58, 96.
British Indians in the Transvaal, 4; Indian Subjects in South Africa, 27.
Budget, The Indian, 33, 35, 36, 37, 89, 95, 96, 97; The "Explanatory Memorandum" Delayed, 96; Debate, Lord G. Hamilton on "Infinite Benefits" and "Infinitesimal Drawbacks," 99; Sir W. Wedderburn's Amendment: Parliament and Indian Finance, 102; Questions on the Bengal Provincial, 36.
Bullet, The Lee-Metford, 33.
Burmese Railways, The, 59; Reported Sale of, 97.

Cabul Treaty, The, 21.
Cantonment of Mhow, The, 15.
"Cat" in the Indian Army, The, 16.
Chitral, and Siam, The Address, 2; The Retention of Chitral, 5, 12; The Chitral Papers, 32; Chitral Proclamation, The, 38; Medals for Chitral and Waziri, 80.
Cholera at Lucknow, 16.
Commission, The Opium, 13; The Hemp Drug, 17; Lord Welby's, 98; on Indian Expenditure, Royal—Extra Supplement for November.
Compensation Allowance, Exchange, 52.
Condition of India, Progress and, 51.
Contagious Diseases in India, 23, 27, 32, 98.
Contracts, Mail Packet, 31.
Coolies, Indian, 24; in Assam, 33.
Cooper's Hill College, 89.
Cordite, The Manufacture of, 27.
Corps, The Indian Staff, 13, 22.
Cotton Duties, The Indian, 8, 13, 17, 35, 50, 52; and the Indian Poor, 38, 39.
Council's Drafts, India, 38.
Court of Small Causes, Bombay, 58, 96.
Cultivation, Poppy, 13, 53.

Defence of the Empire, The, 17.
Delay of Pensions, 18.
Demarcation of Frontiers, 34.
Department, The Abkari, 95.
Despatches, Indian, 57.
Diseases in the Indian Army, Contagious, 23, 27, 32, 95.
Durand Treaty, The: A Blunder of the Forward School, 31, 32, 35.
Duties, The Indian Cotton, 8, 13, 17, 35, 50, 52; and the Indian Poor, 38, 39.

East India (Income and Expenditure), 22, 23, 24; Loans, 27; Company and the Transvaal, 4.
Elephant, The African Wild, 58.
Empire, The Defence of the, 17.
Engineers, The Royal, 11.
Enslavement of Kafirs, The, 34.
Escheat," "Lapse and, 57.
Estates in India, Lapsed, 57.
European Troops in India, 97.
Evictions, etc., Madras Presidency, 94.
Exchange Compensation Allowance, 52.
Execution of Indian Merchants, Reported, 51.
Exhibition at Lisbon, The Indian, 38.
Expedition, The Sudan, 47, 50; Cost of the Sudan, 89.
Expenditure, Royal Commission on Indian, Extra Supplement for November.
Extension, Railway, 89, 96.

Fanatics, The Moplah, 15.
Fibre, Rhea, 50.
Field Howitzers, 4.
Finance, House of Commons and Indian, 97.
Forces beyond the Frontiers, Indian, 13.
"Frontier"? Where is the, 50; The Indian, 58; The Demarcation of Frontiers, 34.
Fund, The Treasury Chest, 53.

Gaols, Bengal, 95, 97.
General List, Officers on the, 18, 45.
Girl Offenders, 96.
Goods, Prison-made, 5.

Health of European Troops, 10.
Hemp Drug Commission, The, 17.
Hospitals at Aden, 22, 80, 97.
Hostilities near Mombasa, 16.
Howitzers, Field, 4.

Illicit Trade in Ammunition, Alleged, 49.
Immigrants in Réunion, Indian, 53.
"Imperial" Institute, The, 30, 32, 33.
Income and Expenditure, East India, 22, 23, 24.
India, Ammunition in, 22, 49; Council's Drafts, 38; Telegrams to, 11; Office, Retirement at 65, 34, 35.
Indian Budget, The, 33, 35, 36, 37, 89, 95, 96, 97, 99, 102.
Irrigation Department, The, 14.

Jabalpur, Resettlements in, 50.
Jhalawar Case, The, 9, 15, 31, 35, 52, 53, 90; The Patna and Jhalawar Cases, 15, 22.

Kafirs, Afghanistan and the, 3, 33; The Enslavement of, 34.
Kafiristan, 8, 14, 22; The Invasion of, 27, 32, 34, 52, 96.
Kythal State, 31, 33; Petition, 80, 97.

Land Revenue Assessment in the Madras Presidency, 22.
Landlordism in Madras, "State," 50.
"Lapse and Escheat," 57.
Lapsed Estates in India, 57.
Lascar Seamen, 28.
Law in India, Mussulman, 55.
Leave and Pension Rules, 97.
Lee-Metford Bullet, The, 33.
Lisbon, The Indian Exhibition at, 38.
Loans, East India, 27.
Lucknow, Cholera at, 16.

Madras, Agricultural Banks in, 16; City Court, 95; Land Revenue Administration, 23; Presidency Evictions, etc., 94; Regiments, 95; Village Service Act, 14, 31.
Mahárájá of Jhalawar, The, 9, 15, 22, 31, 35, 52, 53, 90; of Patna, 15, 22.
Mails, The Indian, 57; Packet Contracts, 31.
Malakand Pass, The Occupation of the, 35.
Manufacture of Cordite, The, 27.
Marine, The Royal Indian, 15.
Mashonaland, Indian Troops and, 57.
Medal, The Indian, 38, 52, 80; for Service in Central Africa, 89.
Medical Department, Army, 11.
Merchants, Reported Execution of Indian, 51.
Mhow, The Cantonment of, 15.
Military and Public Works, 14.
Mills, Sunday work in Indian, 10.
Mints, The Indian, 8, 12, 23.
Mombasa, Hostilities near, 16.
Moplah Fanatics, The, 15; Outbreak in Malabar, 34.
Mortality in India, Prison, 7; in Bengal Prisons, 10, 13.
Museums, Sunday opening of, 16.
Mussulman Law in India, 55.
Mutiny Veterans, Indian, 24.

New Postal Contract for India, The, 35.
Nursing Staff at Aden, The, 22, 80, 97.

Occupation of Chitral, The, 12.
Offenders, Girl, 96.
Officers on the General List, 18, 45; in India, 32; Staff Corps, 13, 22, 45; "Special Terms" for Military, 36.
Operations in the Persian Gulf, 8, 33.
Opium Agency, The Behar, 16; Commission, 13.
Outbreak in Malabar, The Moplah, 34.

Papers Presented, 2, 3, 8, 13, 14, 36, 37, 51, 57, 95, 98.
Pasteur Institute, 96.
Patna, The Mahárájá of, 15; and Jhalawar Cases, 15, 22.
Pensions, Army, 9, 14, 17; Delay of, 18; Deficiency of Indian, 34, 35; Leave and Pension Rules, 97; in the Public Works Department, 99.
Persian Gulf, Operations in the, 8.
Petitions, 2, 18, 27, 31, 51, 80, 89, 90, 97; for Simultaneous Examinations, 3, 90.
Poppy Cultivation, 13, 53.
Post Cards, 13.
Postal Orders, 23; Contract for India, The New, 35.
Prison Mortality in India, 7; in Bengal, 10, 13; Prison-made Goods, 5.
Procedure, The New Rules of, 10.
Proclamation, The Chitral, 38; and Performance, The Occupation of the Malakand Pass, 35.
Progress and Condition of India, 51.
Proprietary Village Service Act, Madras, 14.
Provincial Services, The, 90.
Public Works, Military and, 14.
Punjab Legislative Council—Wanted, 37.

Queen's Speech, The, 1.
Questions on the Bengal Provincial Budget, 36.

Railways, Indian, 18; Construction of in India, 53, 97; Extension of, 89, 96; Report for 1895-6, 58; Traffic Returns, 96; Burmese, 59; Reported Sale of Burmese, 97; Trans-Frontier, 90; The Arrest on a Haidarabad Railway, 51; Steel Sleepers for Indian, 53.
Rates of Wages in Bombay and Madras, 96.
Regiments, The Madras, 95.
Regimental Commands, The Tenure of, 52.
Residents in India, Salaries of British, 58.
Re-Settlements in Jabalpur, 50.
Retirement at 65, India Office, 34, 35; of Uncovenanted Officers, 52.
Réunion, Indian Immigrants in, 53.
Rhea Fibre, 50.
Royal Engineers, The, 11; Indian Marine, 15.
Rules of Procedure, The New, 10.

Salaries of British Residents in India, 58.
Seamen, Lascar, 28.
Select Committee: Proposal for the Appointment of, 97.
Service in India, Army, 11.
Services, The Uncovenanted, 45, 54; The Provincial, 90.
Small Cause Court, Bombay, 58, 96.
Siam, Debate on, 1; Chitral and, 2, 13; Agreement, The, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 24, 53.
Simultaneous Examinations, Petitions for, 3, 90.
Soldiers in India, British, 23, 27.
Sudan, Indian Troops for the, 30, 36, 37, 39, 45, 48, 54; and Mombasa, 38; Expedition, 47, 50; Cost of the Expedition, 89.
"Special Terms" for Military Officers, 36.
Speech, The Queen's, 1.
"State Landlordism in Madras," 50.
Steel Sleepers for Indian Railways, 53.
Suakin, Indian Troops at, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 95, 98; Ordinary Expenses Charged upon India, 54, 59; The Peers as "Little Englanders," 80.
Sugar Cane Industry in Bombay, 49.
Sunday Opening of Museums, 16; Work in Indian Mills, 10.
Supply—Army Estimates, 17.
Surgeon-Major Smith, 16.

Telegrams to India, 11.
Tenure of Regimental Commands, 52.
Trans-Frontier Railways, 90.
Transvaal Question and the East India Company, The, 4; British Indians in the, 4.
Treasury Chest Fund, The, 53.
Treaty, The Kabul, 21; The Durand, 31, 32, 35.
Troops in India, European, 97; Health of European, 10; Disease among European, 95; Indian Troops for Mombasa and the Sudan, 38; Indian Troops and Mashonaland, 57; Indian Troops for the Sudan, 30, 36, 37, 39, 45, 48, 54; Indian Troops at Suakin, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 95, 98; Ordinary Expenses charged upon India, 54, 59; The Peers as "Little Englanders," 80.

Uncovenanted Officers, Retirement of, 51; Services, The, 45, 54.

Veterans, Indian Mutiny, 24.
Village Service Act, The Madras, 14, 31.

Wages in Bombay and Madras, Rates of, 96.
Wanted: A Punjab Legislative Council, 37.
Warlike Operations, 33.
Waziri and Chitral Medals, 80.
"Where is the Frontier?" 50.

// INDIA
A Record and Review of Indian Affairs
PUBLISHED MONTHLY
EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.
ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.
VOL. VII., No. 1. (NEW SERIES.)] JANUARY, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	1
The Judiciary and the Executive in India:	
I.—By Sir Richard Garth	8
II.—By Sir J. B. Phear	8
III.—By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	9
IV.—By J. Dacosta	10
The Betrayal of Kafiristan, by an Ex-Diplomatist	11
The Indiscretions of Sir C. Elliott, by A. Nundy	12
British Opinions on Indian Affairs:	
The Judiciary and the Executive	13
Tories and the Cotton Duties	14
The Poona Congress: Telegraphic Report	16
The Eleventh Congress	17
The Great Mogul	18
Ditticisms	20
Our London Letter	21
Lord Hobhouse on Indian Affairs	22
Lord G. Hamilton on the Cotton Duties	24
Lord James's reply to Sir H. James	26
Reviews: A Soldier of the Mutiny	26
Myths and Folk-Lore	28
Indian Stories	29
"Twenty-one Days in India"	29
The Second Jungle-Book	30
The Story of the Sea	30
"The Relief of Chitral"	31
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	32
Recent Official Publications	32

Indiana.

The Judiciary and the Executive.

We print on another page a series of important communications upon the relations of the Executive to the Judiciary in India, with reference to the "interview" with Mr. Manomohan Ghose which appeared in our issue for December last. It would be impossible to exaggerate the significance of the opinions expressed by Sir Richard Garth, who speaks with the authority of a Privy Councillor and a former Chief Justice of Bengal, and by Sir J. B. Phear, who after holding the office of Judge of the High Court of Calcutta was appointed Chief Justice of Ceylon. These high authorities confirm the grave allegations made by Mr. Manomohan Ghose—allegations which, we may add, were proved in each instance by reference to ascertained cases—and, while the experience of Sir J. B. Phear in Ceylon strengthens the demand for reform, Sir Richard Garth declares, on the strength of indisputable evidence, that the Government of India approves the scandalous system described by Mr. Ghose, and would be very sorry to see it altered. The facts which Mr. Ghose brought to light have, we are happy to find, received some attention at the hands of the British press, though but an inconsiderable fraction of the attention which they deserve. Sir Richard Garth makes the excellent suggestion that Mr. Ghose's statement should be sent to every member of Parliament, both Lords and Commons. We propose not only to carry out this suggestion but also, on the eve of the re-opening of Parliament, to issue a pamphlet containing, in addition to Mr. Ghose's statement and a collection of authoritative opinions upon it, the scheme of reform formulated in our columns by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt more than two years ago. Further steps, we understand, will also be taken by members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee and of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress to bring the whole matter to the notice of Parliament and of the Secretary of State for India. It will then, at any rate, be no longer possible for apologists of the present system to maintain that it is continued because of the ignorance of those who, in the last analysis, are responsible for it and for the hateful injustice that it so frequently encourages.

The Viceroy's Tour.

Considering the difficulties which a bureaucratic Government must always experience in learning the wants and wishes of the people committed to its charge, we are amazed to discover from time to time how reluctant the Government of India is to make use of such channels of communication as exist. There is, it is true, good reason to believe that it is adopting a more sensible and friendly attitude towards the Indian National Congress, which is, of course, at

once the most faithful and the most comprehensive index of independent public opinion in India. But the Government of India, even in its present disposition towards the Congress, fails to manifest the cordial temper which animates such competent critics as Sir Richard Garth, and its attitude towards minor organisations which seek to give utterance to popular demands can only be described as deplorable. The *Times* announced the other day that Lord Elgin had returned to Calcutta and that his "reception was of a private character." If this phrase meant that his return was not marked by any public demonstration of goodwill, we are not greatly surprised. When Lord Elgin went out to India he was generously treated by the leaders of non-official opinion and by the native press. But of late our correspondents in India have agreed in sending us discouraging reports of his administration and behaviour. His treatment of local public bodies during his recent tour undoubtedly adds force to these complaints and regrets. In particular, his application of the "gag" to such representative and public-spirited bodies as the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and the Madras Mahajana Sabha has excited just indignation. Whether one turns to the *Hindu* at Madras, or the *Tribune* at Lahore, or the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* at Calcutta, it is the same story. All alike are surprised and indignant at what we may call Lord Elgin's "short way with public addresses."

"An Inconvenient Opportunity."

The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, following the usual practice, had supplemented its address of welcome with a useful statement of local public opinion upon some of the important questions of the day. The Sabha discussed, for example, such matters as conciliation between different religious communities, the proposals contained in the new Jury Bill, and the enhancement of rent in agricultural re-settlements. We should have thought that any responsible official who did not wish to live in a fool's paradise would have been glad to learn what people were thinking and saying about these questions. Lord Elgin, on the contrary, appears to have been positively irritated. "The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha," says the *Hindu*, "had to read to His Excellency a mutilated address—mutilated at His Excellency's desire. The same fate, we hear, has befallen other public bodies who sent their draft addresses to him." Nor was that all. When the address, in its revised or mutilated form, was presented to him, Lord Elgin read the members of the Sabha something very like a lecture upon the composition of such addresses. They should consist, he said, partly of courteous greetings and partly of a record of local questions. As for those "other questions of greater and graver interest which concern not merely the locality but the community at large," Lord Elgin declared bluntly that "this is an inconvenient opportunity for discussing questions of that kind." He added: "I assert with some confidence that to give their true value to general statements made by bodies, however representative, when they deal with controversial topics in a short and summary manner, you must have full knowledge of the discussions that preceded the conclusion, or full opportunity of discussing them at the time; and, on the other hand, it is a painful, if not intolerable, position that a man replying to a welcome should be called upon to controvert facts or challenge fallacies which he cannot accept, but equally cannot altogether ignore." In the spirit of these remarkable observations Lord Elgin proceeded to suggest that the opinions expressed by the Sabha were not the result of discussion at all; to dismiss their representations on the subject of enhanced rents with an airy assertion that if he had time and opportunity he could produce facts and figures which would refute them; to say that responsibility in respect of religious disturbances rested with the police; and to complain that a "wholly disproportionate excitement" had been "got up over" the Jury Bill. These were, surely, strange words for a Liberal Viceroy, and it is hard to see what useful purpose Lord Elgin can have imagined that they would serve. In the case of the address drafted by the Madras Mahajana Sabha the Madras Government required the omission of three useful paragraphs discussing the growth of military expenditure and the consequent burdens upon the rayats and neglect of public works. The Sabha rightly declined to present its address in the mutilated form so fatuously suggested.

Lord Elgin Refutes Himself.

We do not wonder that this new departure of the Viceroy's has provoked surprise and regret. Indian critics remark that it is "in consonance with the peculiarity of taciturnity which is likely to distinguish the present Administration." They point out that "it has been the practice till now for the various local bodies of the country to utilise the occasion of the Governor-General's visit for the purpose of placing before him the views of non-official bodies on topics not merely of local importance, but of imperial and general importance also." It was so, of course, in the time of Lord Ripon. It was so in the time of Lord Dufferin. It was so in the time of Lord Lansdowne. The *Hindu* urges Lord Elgin to look into the addresses that were presented to Lord Ripon and the replies which he made to them. Indeed, Lord Elgin's own reply illustrates, unintentionally, the value of such opportunities of com-

munication between the people and their servants, the Government. In his remarks upon the Jury Bill Lord Elgin said that the portion of it which had excited most opposition had been inserted merely in order that it might be "carefully and deliberately considered in the proceedings of the Legislative Council." Who, in the absence of this explanation on Lord Elgin's part, would ever have supposed that the purpose of the Government was so purely academic? Again, in his remarks upon re-settlement, Lord Elgin showed that he misunderstood the view put forward by independent public opinion. The misunderstanding might easily have been removed in the course of discussion. It is earnestly to be hoped that Lord Elgin, no less for his own and the Government's sake than for the people's sake, will see the error of his ways. "We could understand it," the *Hindu* writes, "if the collector of a district desired to expunge certain unpalatable truths from a public address to be presented to the Governor; but that the representative of the Queen should betray similar fears in regard to important questions of public policy is extremely unfortunate, and can be justified on no hypothesis except that their inclusion would imply harm to public interests. Lack of courage to face public questions in a statesmanlike manner is the least excusable reason which a Viceroy could assign for his anxiety to avoid debatable topics; but the public will have to be excused if they attribute some such reason to the present attitude of Lord Elgin." Impartial Englishmen who read criticisms like this can only add: "Pudet hœc opprobria nobis et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli."

The Bureaucrat can do no wrong.

Sir Charles Elliott, whose administration as Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal was recently reviewed in our columns by Mr. Parbati C. Roy, seems to have taken the bull boldly by the horns on the eve of his retirement. According to the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* he "pronounced," in a speech at a farewell dinner given to him by the Civil Service, "against the principle of the public censure of officials." "Here's richness," as Mr. Squeers would say. Sir Charles Elliott has not usually been regarded as a humourist, but the rest of his remarks as reported by the *Times* are rich enough to merit quotation. This "principle of the public censure of officials obtained," he said, "nowhere else than in India, where it was the more unnecessary because of the efficiency of the Civil Service. Public censure lowered the prestige of the Service, therefore it should be avoided." Time and space would alike fail us if we were to attempt to do justice to these really immortal words. We can only glance rapidly at a few of the facets of so brilliant a gem. What is "the principle of the public censure of officials?" Presumably it is the ordinary principle of praising the good and blaming the bad. It will be news to many to learn that in India alone is this principle to be found in operation. There are those, perchance, in Whitehall who will hear it with surprise, not unmingled with amusement. We relish especially that phrase "the more unnecessary." Sir C. Elliott's argument plainly is that the most inefficient Civil Servants ought not to be censured, and that, where they are efficient, censure is especially superfluous. We can imagine—but then again perhaps we cannot—the frantic enthusiasm which such sentiments would naturally excite at a Civil Service dinner. For Sir Charles Elliott's closing epigram we have indeed nothing but praise. Civil Servants, especially bureaucratic Civil Servants in India, cannot do better than "avoid public censure." To this end they have an excellent manual of conduct before their eyes. Let them study the administration of Sir Charles Elliott—and refrain from doing likewise. After all, what Sir C. Elliott says is what only too many bureaucrats in India think. He differs from many others not in opinion, but in candour. He is the Athelstan Riley of the Government of India.

A Case for Parliament.

One of the chief grievances of the people of India against the Government is that, in its capacity as landlord, it levies oppressive charges upon the struggling rayat. The screw is applied especially at times of re-settlement when, as we have frequently shown, rents are increased by 100, 200, and even 300 per cent. The cases of the Alibag and Panwel talukas are probably fresh in the minds of our readers. It seems, however, that the blame must not be laid solely upon the Government. The *Hindu*, in the course of a recent series of valuable articles upon the Godavari re-settlement, charged the Government of Madras with setting aside its pledges in respect of land revenue settlement in that Presidency. "If," it wrote, "by guaranteeing a certain rate of interest the Government has attracted foreign capital for the construction of railways in this country, we say that the Government has attracted indigenous capital and labour to the improvement of land by guaranteeing in no less unmistakable terms that the grain valuation of soils will be final, that the rayat's improvements will not be taxed, and that the revision of settlements will be regulated by changes in general prices. To disturb the grain value assigned at the settlement to any particular soil and transfer it from Class III. or II. to Class I., and thus raise its grain valuation for the purposes of assessment, is tantamount in our opinion to adding, in a railway debenture, a clause reducing the rate of interest

from four to two per cent. some years after the construction of the railway." So far, so good. But it now appears, from an official answer to an interpellation, that while the Government of Madras was willing to give effect to the liberal policy enunciated by Lord Ripon's Government in 1883, this policy was, in 1885, disallowed by the Secretary of State. What is still more curious is that the despatch of the Secretary of State to this effect was not, apparently, communicated to the Madras Government until the end of 1893. The Madras Government was then compelled, after this delay, to revise its policy accordingly. "Between 1885 and 1893, that is, for a space of eight years, the local Government was kept in ignorance of the fact of the great scheme for re-settlement which Lord Ripon so humanely and wisely promulgated having been set aside by the Secretary of State, and the new rules to suit the new retrograde policy were not embodied in the usual official publication for another two years, that is, till May, 1895." This remarkable disclosure is well worthy of the early attention of Parliament.

Tories and the Cotton Duties.

A deputation from Lancashire waited upon Lord George Hamilton on December 16th in order to lay before him the strong objections of employers and operatives in the cotton industry in Lancashire to the Indian import duties. On the previous day that zealous Tory organ, the *St. James's Gazette*, repeating a mis-statement which we have had to correct before, declared that in the division on Sir H. James's motion last February the Conservative leaders refrained from obliging the electors of Lancashire. It is to be presumed that this is the occasion to which the *St. James's* refers in its phrase "when Sir Henry Fowler brought in the duties." As a matter of fact, Sir Henry Fowler never did bring in the duties. They were brought in by Sir James Westland in India, and, so far as they entered into the debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons, they were in the charge of Lord George Hamilton. What Sir Henry Fowler—or, as he then was, Mr. Fowler—had to meet was a vote of censure upon the late Liberal Government in the form of a motion for adjournment moved by Sir Henry James, then member for Bury, Lancashire, now Lord James, Chancellor of the Duchy, and a member of Lord Salisbury's Cabinet. "When the division came" two-thirds of all the Conservative members who were present voted with Sir H. James against the cotton duties. He had also the support of the Conservative whips who, in anticipation of the division, had issued a five-lined whip to the members of their party. But that, as everybody except the *St. James's* knows, was not all, nor the most significant incident. Immediately before the division was taken the cotton duties were denounced by Lord George Hamilton in a set speech in which he stated that he spoke with the express approval and agreement of Lord Salisbury himself. Lord George Hamilton declared in this authoritative fashion, and ostensibly on behalf of the Tory party, that the cotton duties were unjust and unfair, impolitic and inexpedient. That speech, together with Sir H. James's speech and the division-lists, formed the basis of the Conservative appeal to Lancashire at the General Election. The *St. James's* now repudiates "whatever individual members of the Ministry may have said when they were in positions of greater freedom and less responsibility." But this summary attempt to dispose of the matter, ungracious as it is to Lord G. Hamilton and Lord James, will not suffice. For when Lord G. Hamilton had been appointed Secretary for India and a Cabinet Minister, he went out of his way to re-assert, in the most emphatic terms and at the most critical moment, the opinions which he had expressed with Lord Salisbury's sanction in February. Invited to speak in the Accrington division of Lancashire on behalf of the Tory candidate on the eve of the polling, he wrote that he was too busy to go. But he added that his speech against the duties, to which he still adhered, and which had been followed by his appointment to the India Office, ought to help Conservative candidates in Lancashire. The *St. James's* may well be anxious to forget this incident—probably, under all the circumstances, the most scandalous incident in recent political history.

Our Opportunity in Lancashire.

The question of Lord G. Hamilton's electioneering tactics, aided and abetted by Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour, is one thing. The question of the cotton duties themselves is another thing. When the General Election was over, and the Conservatives had secured a majority of 152, Mr. Balfour, who as Conservative candidate for East Manchester had said a very great deal to encourage and very little indeed to discourage the demands and expectations of Lancashire electors, roundly declared that there was no important difference of opinion between Lord George Hamilton and his predecessor. It would be difficult to exaggerate the interest with which the people of Lancashire regard this question, and the really amazing thing is that the opponents of the "forward" frontier policy are not exerting themselves more in order to direct this quite unusual manifestation of public interest in Indian affairs into the most useful channel. Already the people of Lancashire have begun to ask what were the causes of the financial embarrassments in India that led

to the re-imposition of the cotton duties, and already many of them are coming to perceive that the chief cause was extravagant military expenditure, especially upon useless and worse than useless schemes of trans-frontier aggression. Yet it does not appear that the Liberal party, who opposed the retention of Chitral, are bestirring themselves in order to drive this lesson home. The opportunity is, however, singularly promising, as the Lancashire Conservative members who are most prominent in the condemnation of the cotton duties approved the retention of Chitral and voted against Mr. Maclean's amendment last September. Whatever else the cotton duties may or may not have done they have certainly proved to Lancashire that the evil results of financial extravagance in India are not confined to the people of India alone. This inkling of a community of interest should be developed and turned to good account. We repeat what we have said before, that there is now offered to all whom it may concern an exceptional opportunity of fostering in a large and important section of the British electorate a deep and sympathetic interest in wise and economical administration in India.

The Financial Outlook.

Lord George Hamilton's reply to the deputation was, as will be seen from a quotation from the *Manchester Guardian* which we print elsewhere, received with little satisfaction in Lancashire. In view of his previous utterances on the same subject no other result was to be expected. Lord George Hamilton now takes up precisely the position which was taken up by Sir Henry Fowler, namely, that the cotton duties are necessary in order to produce financial equilibrium in India, that they can be repealed only when that equilibrium comes to be independent of them, and that in the meantime, far from desiring "protection," he is anxious to secure perfect equality of treatment for Lancashire and Bombay. It is significant that, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, at least a few years must elapse before the duties are likely to be repealed. If he had talked in this strain last February, or written in this strain last July, it may be doubted whether he would now be Secretary of State, and it is certain that the Parliamentary representation of Lancashire would be different from what it is. His speech has, however, been welcomed with natural jubilation in Calcutta and Bombay. News from both centres states that the financial prospects of the Government of India have lately improved, and that, chiefly through the more hopeful state of exchange, Sir J. Westland may be able to announce something like equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. On the other hand, it is pointed out that, as the cotton imports are below the average, the estimated income from the duties will not be realised; that the effect of several bad opium seasons will be acutely felt next year; that the saving in sterling liabilities on account of exchange compensation will be "more than absorbed by Chitral"; and that, consequently, there will certainly not be sufficient margin for the repeal of the cotton duties. It is to be hoped that this reference to Chitral will be laid to heart by the Lancashire electors whose representatives — having pledged themselves to secure the immediate repeal of the cotton duties—straightway supported Lord Salisbury's Government in the retention of Chitral.

A Handsome Explanation.

We know now why Lord Rosebery and his colleagues unanimously decided to withdraw from Chitral. It was not because they agreed with Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook and Lord Ripon that the "forward" policy increased, instead of diminishing, the danger of Russian invasion. It was not because, with General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, Sir Donald Stewart and Sir Charles Gough, they perceived the folly of paving the way for a hostile army. It was not because, with Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour, they grasped the fact that the "forward" policy lay at the root of the financial embarrassments of the Government of India. It was not because, having secured the relief of Dr. Robertson and his gallant force, they had accomplished the only avowed purpose of the Chitral expedition. It was not because they had issued a proclamation declaring that their sole object was to put an end to aggression on Chitral territory, and that as soon as this object had been attained the force would be withdrawn. No, it was for none of these reasons that Lord Rosebery and his colleagues came to the wise decision which their successors so hastily reversed. It was merely as a sop to the "little Englanders" who had been annoyed by the annexation of Uganda, and whose goodwill was desirable on the eve of a General Election. So, at least, we are assured by that veracious gentleman, Lord George Hamilton. The late Government's decision was, he informed an audience on November 26th, merely an electioneering dodge, and to this end the wicked Liberals were prepared "to throw away all the fruits of the successful expedition to Chitral, and to abandon the country where the successful operations had taken place." The methods of the "gentlemanly" party are peculiar, if not exactly convincing. India was, indeed, made to serve an electioneering turn at the late General Election. But the subject of the trick was the cotton duties, and its author was Lord George Hamilton.

"Only a Little One."

The cry is "still they come." Hardly have the echoes of the Chitral engagements died away when the news comes from Calcutta that a punitive expedition is being sent to the Lushai Hills. Thus does East answer to West with the senseless lust of war. The information which is vouchsafed to us is that "a small expedition of 600 rifles is being sent to the North Lushai hills in two columns, operating from Assam and Burma. The object is to punish Kairuma, a chief who has always been hostile. His district is the only one which is not under complete control." It is the old story. The rupees of Indian taxpayers are to be squandered with the usual recklessness, while Parliament ignores the folly, and even cotton-spinning Lancashire returns representatives to encourage it. The latest scene for the operations of restless and ambitious military officers in India is a district in Upper Burma, lying to the North of the Arakan Hill Tracts and the South of Manipur. A heavy score already stands against it in the account-book of the Indian taxpayer, as the following statement of the Government of India's war bill for the last eighteen years will show:—

	Rs.
Afghanistan	181,901,320
Egypt..	12,240,160
Burma	60,735,000
Quetta	22,880,710
Hazara	3,110,320
Lushai and Chin Hills	8,397,740
Sikkim	2,859,160
Manipur	3,234,070
Miranzai	1,965,360
"Minor Operations"	3,265,530
Mobilization	4,059,450
Camps of Exercise	1,462,270
	306,111,090

Three hundred and six millions of rupees in eighteen years! Lord George Hamilton informed the deputation from Lancashire a fortnight ago that the repeal of the cotton duties was conditional upon the restoration of financial equilibrium in India. How many of the wiseacres who constituted that deputation will reflect that, unless precedent is egregiously departed from in this case, the present useless expedition against the inoffensive Kairuma will swallow up a good deal more than the total yield of the cotton duties during the whole twelve months? And the present expedition, as the mother in the story said of her infant, is "only a little one."

"British Subjects" in South Africa.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji introduced to Mr. Chamberlain last August a deputation of Indian gentlemen resident in London who protested against the disabilities imposed upon British Indian subjects under various Governments in South Africa. To the grievances which were then brought to the notice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies another has since been added. On October 7th last the Volksraad of the South African Republic, in a resolution ratifying the treaty between the British Government and the Government of the South African Republic which protected British subjects in the Republic from compulsory military service, went out of its way to declare that the term British subjects meant only white persons. The British Indian Defence Committee at Johannesburg at once despatched a telegram to London protesting against this odious and iniquitous racial distinction, and the telegram has now been supplemented by a concise Memorial. There is, of course, no reason in the world why the exemption granted to British subjects who happen to be of one colour should be denied to British subjects who happen to be of another colour. The Indian resident in the Transvaal is not a burgher. He is, equally with British residents, denied civil rights. His political exemptions ought equally to correspond with his civic disabilities. The Memorial was at once forwarded to Mr. Chamberlain by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who added a covering letter in these terms:—

"In continuation of the deputation which I had the honour of introducing to you on August 29th on the subject of the grievances of British Indian subjects in South Africa, I have now to submit to you copies of a telegram and of a Memorial which I hope may have independently reached you. You will observe that the whole point of this reference consists in the fact that, in ratifying the recent treaty, the Government of the South African Republic took upon itself to define British subjects, therein referred to, as only white persons, thereby depriving all British Indian subjects of that protection from compulsory military service which Her Majesty's Government had found it necessary to insist upon for all British subjects. I venture to hope that you will see your way to disallow this arbitrary limitation of the meaning of the term 'British subjects.'"

The Government of the Transvaal is making itself conspicuous for retrogade policy, but this piece of arrogance is too cool. To inflict the penalties of citizenship upon those who are denied its rights is inequitable. To undertake to limit the meaning of the term British subjects is a piece of effrontery which Mr. Chamberlain will surely refuse to tolerate.

India's Sea-borne Trade.

The returns of the "Trade and Navigation of British India" are issued monthly from the Government Press at Calcutta. Few copies of these compendious tables of current Indian commerce seem to reach this country. No doubt merchants and bankers who are regularly engaged in trade and monetary transactions with our great Asiatic dependency find all the statistics relating thereto in their own prices current and shipping reports. With economists and statisticians, who desire to take more comprehensive surveys of the whole commercial and monetary relations between India and the rest

of the world, the case is somewhat different. They are not so much concerned with the details of the current course of trade; they more generally wish to look at the large totals and especially to compare one year with another on a series of years. Thus they have to postpone such surveys until the Statistical Department of the Government of India issues its finally revised returns for quinquennial periods. With the aid of these monthly returns of Indian sea-borne commerce it is (writes an Anglo-Indian correspondent) possible to combine, to some extent, retrospective lessons with indications of the net results of India's trade at a much later date. This will be more obvious if we set out the totals of the last available six months ending with September and showing the corresponding periods for the two previous years; these returns always presenting a triennal comparison. Here is a statement which exhibits that comparison at a glance:—

SEA-BORNE TRADE OF BRITISH INDIA:

THREE HALF-YEARS, MARCH TO SEPT., 1893-4-5.

Exports.	1893. Rx.	1894. Rx.	1895. Rx.
Merchandise	50,963,846	53,622,769	52,283,000
Treasure	1,922,482	5,080,399	2,296,448
	52,886,328	58,703,168	54,579,448
Imports.			
Merchandise	33,650,319	34,704,026	33,708,799
Treasure	9,624,518	5,121,850	5,971,784
	43,274,837	39,825,876	39,680,583
Excess of India's Exports over Imports	9,611,491	18,877,292	14,893,865

A Crushing Adverse Balance. This plan of dealing only with the clear totals presents to economists the one great fact that differentiates the course and results of Indian commercial transactions from those of nearly all other countries in the world. In those three half-years India's trade outgoings were more than her incomings by Rx. $43\frac{1}{3}$ millions. It may be queried whether, since the half-years in the above table include the season when Indian export business is more active than the other six months, that excess is not rather beyond the average. But the Secretary of State's "Explanatory Memorandum" shows that the excess of India's exports over her imports in 1893-4 was Rx. 13,321,000, and in 1894-5 Rx. 34,082,000, that is—a total for the two years of Rx. $47\frac{1}{2}$ millions. In the former of these two years there had been returned to India "enfaced rupee paper" to the amount of Rs. 1,800,000 which *pro tanto* reduced the excess exports in that year from the figure of Rx. 15,121,000. This unusual transfer of Government paper—as also Rx. 1,572,000 in the previous year, 1892-3—was one incident consequent on the disturbance of trade arising from the uncertainty of the fate of silver and speculation in expectation of the closing of the Indian mints to free coinage. But this was only a temporary and surface eddy in the constant stream of excess exports from India, by far the larger proportion of which flows into and sustains the channels of commercial prosperity in the United Kingdom. There is one other incidental remark to be made on the above table; namely, that while in the year 1893-4 the net import of silver into India was about Rx. 8 millions (gold, nearly balancing) in 1894-5, there was a large export of gold—nearly four million tens of rupees—and, for the first time in a series of years, India's imports and exports of treasure nearly balanced. These incidental variations, though they have interest in their bearing on current transactions of the merchant and banker, are all within the one great fact to which the attention of statesmen and economists must be more and more directed, that India sends out, year after year, tens of millions worth of her revenues and resources, more than she receives, though, as Mr. Giffen has demonstrated, the normal condition of any country is that its figure of imports shall exceed its exports. In India's never adjusted commercial balance-sheet is exhibited the chief explanation of her weak industrial and material condition. This is evidence that the most fatuous optimist cannot gainsay. When and how will responsible statesmen set themselves to redress this crushing adverse balance?

The Eleventh Congress. We print on another page a brief telegraphic report, received just as we go to press, of the early proceedings of the Eleventh Indian National Congress, which met at Poona on December 27th. The report is too meagre for extended notice, but it will be disappointing to those amiable persons who, with the thought that is the offspring of the wish, have persuaded themselves that the strength of the Congress is waning. An organization which can muster some 1,600 delegates and 4,000 visitors from all parts of so vast a country is in a fairly robust condition. The Congress has passed the age of infancy, with its troubles and travails, its fears and anxieties. It was an outbreak of cholera that accidentally prevented the first Congress from meeting in Poona, the seat of Brahmanical orthodoxy. The Congress pavilion is a magnificent structure erected for the purpose near Fergusson College, on the way to Gunesh Khind, the site of Government House. It will be seen that the President laid special stress upon simultaneous examinations, the Finance Commission, and the speedy return of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to the House of Commons.

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE IN INDIA.

I.—BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR RICHARD GARTH, Q.C.,

Late Chief Justice in Bengal.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged to you for the copy which you have been kind enough to send me of what passed at the "interview" with Mr. Manomohan Ghose upon the much vexed question of the unseemly conflict which is still going on in India between the Judicial and Executive Services.

Mr. Ghose's able exposition of the true nature of that conflict and the disgraceful state of things to which it has given rise in Bengal is, I am sorry to say, only too true; and no man is better qualified than he is to deal with this subject, because for the last 25 years he has had a large experience at the Calcutta Bar, and has more especially devoted himself to criminal practice in the Mofussil, so that he has himself been actually engaged in a large number of the cases which he describes, and knows as well as any man the evils of the present system, the grievous injustice to which it is constantly giving rise, and the utter fallacy of the excuses which are made by the Government for not rectifying this shameful abuse.

The real truth is, as Mr. Ghose tells us, and as Sir Charles Elliott and some other high officials in India are honest enough openly to avow, that the Government of India *approves* this scandalous system, and (whatever the Secretary of State may say to the contrary) would be very sorry to see it altered. In point of fact, if the Government had its will, the independence of the judges would be still further controlled, and the High Courts themselves made subservient to the will of the Executive.

If I may be allowed to make a suggestion, I think that Mr. Ghose's statement, which is thoroughly well considered and deserving of great respect, should be sent to every member of Parliament, both Lords and Commons.

No pains should be spared, in my opinion, in your endeavour to inform Parliament and the British press and public of the true nature of this great question.—I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

RICHARD GARTH.

December 8th, 1895.

II.—BY SIR J. B. PHEAR,

Late Chief Justice in Ceylon.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—You have done a great public service by publishing the details of your "interview" with Mr. Manomohan Ghose upon the above topic. This gentleman, by reason of his near upon thirty years experience in the active and, I may add, eminently successful practice of his profession in the High Court of Calcutta, as well as in the local courts throughout the Presidency of Bengal, is peculiarly entitled to be listened to when he speaks upon the important subject with which the "interview" deals. And apart from this, his English education, his long familiarity and indeed identification with highly cultured English society and its ways of life, and his unquestioned sympathy with and loyalty to British rule in India combine to give especial weight and value to his utterances on behalf of his countrymen in this matter.

It is deplorable to perceive from Mr. Ghose's statement that there still lurks in influential quarters an indisposition to recognise the extreme importance, especially under the circumstances of our rule in India, of keeping the judicial and executive functions, so far as practicable, apart. I had imagined that all question on this point had been set at rest, so far as the expression of authoritative opinion could operate, at least a quarter of a century ago, and that financial and service difficulties alone have hitherto hindered the full attainment of the desired reform.

It fell to me after leaving India, and when largely responsible for the administration of justice in Ceylon, to advise the Government of that colony upon the working of the local courts of justice under a system of mixed functions analogous to that of India; and to indicate with some closeness of examination the serious evils which inevitably result from the judicial inefficiency incidental to such a system, and of which, it may be mentioned, not the least is a vicious use of civil and criminal proceedings, so often supposed by Englishmen to be characteristic of Oriental peoples, but more properly attributable to the infirmity and misunderstood attitude of the courts themselves.

I do not, of course, ask you to burden your columns with material drawn from this source; but I may perhaps be allowed to add that the European planters in Ceylon, a very influential portion of the community and deeply interested in the efficiency of the local courts, have recently, as I am informed, pressed the Government for a reform of the judicial system with express reference to the grounds disclosed in this official communication.

The second head of Mr. Ghose's complaint is even more to be regretted than the first. That there should be any such persistent endeavours on the part of any Government of British training to make the Judiciary practically subservient to the Executive as Mr. Ghose represents to have lately been manifested in Bengal, is difficult to believe—not that incentives to such an endeavour are inconceivable, but that to yield to these would be symptomatic of a lower order of statesmanship than one would like to attribute to one of the subordinate Governments of India. There may be and probably are local officials who think that the prestige of the Executive, as they understand it, must be maintained at any cost and at whatever hazard; but all should by this time know that the true strength of the British rule in India consists in the approach which it makes to the unbiassed administration of justice by the civil and criminal courts not merely as between private persons but also between private persons of all classes and the Government; and that the surest way of upholding the prestige of the Executive in the eyes of the people and securing its efficiency is to make it the visible supporter of an independent, impartial and competent judiciary. A step in the opposite direction is but a source of weakness to the

Executive itself. This lesson has been written for us in almost every page of our own history, and I feel pretty confident that Sir Charles Elliott's successor is not one to disregard it.—Yours obediently,

J. B. Phear.

Marpool, *December 18th*, 1895.

III.—By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

In the December number of India Mr. Manomohan Ghose's views on the crying question of the relations of the judiciary and the executive in India were set forth in the most pointed and lucid manner possible. They constitute a formidable indictment of the Indian and the Home Government. The keenest adversary would not accuse Mr. Ghose of overstating his case. It is to be hoped that the question will be taken up by public opinion in England, where the existing union of judicial and executive functions in India cannot be looked upon without shame and abhorrence. The essential difficulty here is to get Englishmen to understand what is the matter of complaint; but with Mr. Ghose's statement before them, they can have no further excuse for remaining apathetic over the longstanding grievance of their fellow-subjects in India.

There can be no question that on this serious matter of administration the Indian National Congress represents the universal feeling of the country. The demand for the separation of judicial and executive functions has stood on the Congress programme for many years; and the subject has been so completely thrashed out in all its bearings that Mr. Ananda Charlu last year moved the resolution without a speech. It may be well to reproduce the terms of the resolution, so as to show the exact attitude of the Congress to the question:

"That this Congress having till now vainly appealed for many successive years to the Government of India, and also to the Secretary of State, to remove one of the gravest defects in the system of administration and one fraught with incalculable oppression to all classes of people throughout the country, and having noted with satisfaction the admission of the evil by two former Secretaries of State (Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross), and being of opinion that the reform is thoroughly practicable, as has been shown by Messrs. R. C. Dutt, M. M. Ghose, and P. M. Mehta, entreats the Government of India to direct the immediate appointment in each province of a Committee (one half at least of whose members shall be non-official natives of India, qualified by education and experience in the workings of various Courts to deal with the question) to prepare a scheme for the complete separation of all Judicial and Executive functions in their own province with as little additional cost to the State as may be practicable, and the submission of such schemes, with the opinions of the several Governments thereon, at an early date."

There is no difference of independent opinion, in fact, as to the urgent necessity of reform. Mr. Ghose cited telling illustrations from his own experience in Bengal. The records of the Congress debates contain similar examples from the most diverse parts of India. Previous to all experience of the system, it might have been fully anticipated that the results would prove no less unsatisfactory than they have actually done. It is the simplest thing in the world for the unthinking obstructionist to say with the Hon. Mr. Nugent, of the Bombay Legislative Council, that "the present system works very well." As we shall see, this is in a sense true; but that is no reason why the system should not work very much better. The scathing criticism of Mr. Nugent's comfortable remark, which Mr. A. C. Mazoomdar addressed to the Congress at Lahore two years ago, indicates how urgently necessary is the reform demanded:—

"The present system works very well indeed! But very well for whom? That is the question. Yes, it is very well for some person to be able to chase and belabour with impunity a tender boy of eleven years of age for the grave offence of saying 'Good Morning' to a European, and then to have his complaint dismissed because the beating did not leave any mark on his person. It is very well indeed for a Deputy Commissioner to be able to tear off documentary evidence against him from the records of a Court of Justice, and enjoy greater immunity than a Duchess in England. How very well it is to have an unfortunate gentleman tried thrice over for the same alleged offence, because each time the order of discharge failed to recommend itself to the District Magistrate, and then to have him ultimately convicted by a subordinate magistrate. It is of course very well for a settlement officer to be able to go armed with a gun and force open the Zenana of a respectable zemindar, and thence drag him in illness a distance of thirty miles, and after all this to be sure to get the support and sympathies of the district and the divisional authorities. How very well is it for an assistant magistrate to be able to set at naught the order of a Sessions Judge for bail, and keep a poor stamp vendor in jail at his own sweet pleasure; and how supremely well it is for a magistrate to have the fancy to drive quietly through the crowded streets of one of the busiest cities in the country, and finding a slow-moving, heavy-laden cart in his way, to come down and flog the unfortunate driver to the ground, and then have the poor man's complaint compromised in the court of a subordinate magistrate . . . . A Magistrate of Patna has . . . . ruled that the time for cross-examination of witnesses for the prosecution should be always cut down to five minutes."

The vista of petty tyranny opened up by these examples, which are too trifling to get beyond local knowledge, ought to be enough to satisfy independent observers that here is an intolerable grievance demanding immediate and thorough-going reform. Let Englishmen take such cases as these home to themselves, and then say what they think of the system under which they are possible occurrences.

On the face of things, the two functions are gravely incompatible. The Executive officer necessarily keeps his eyes open over the whole field of his jurisdiction, and gathers in all sorts of information on which it is possible for him to lay his hands. Such information must, in the very nature of things, be *ex parte*. It is unsifted. It may be, almost inevitably must be, extremely incomplete. It may be honestly reported, and yet be wholly mistaken. It may also be dishonestly, or carelessly, reported. At best it can be received only as provisional. The Judicial officer, on the other hand, is bound to confine his attention to the evidence laid before him under the rules of procedure. He may not look beyond the evidence and the law on the particular subject. In every case, almost necessarily, he will have before him a considerable mass of information on the point at issue, to which the executive officer has had no access whatever. The two functions are too obviously distinct and incompatible for anything in the nature of serious argument.

If there is one thing more than another in our administration of India on which we pride ourselves,

if there is one element of our conduct in India of more value to us than another for the stability of our rule, if there is one principle more than another that the people of England would wish to see carried fully into operation in the dependency—it is English justice. Mr. Ghose, one is happy to observe, acknowledges that justice was never better administered in India; that person and property were never more secure; that the blessings of a pure administration are generally appreciated; and that to such appreciation are mainly due the loyalty and contentment of the masses of the people. No doubt what Mr. Ghose says of Bengal is true of the other provinces. But all these facts go to emphasise the fundamental importance of allowing no blots to besmirch the fair face of justice. "I regret," says Mr. Ghose, "to say that the course of justice does not always go evenly when racial considerations are involved. In criminal cases especially the racial element frequently leads to gross miscarriage of justice." The point is mildly and delicately put; but it is a most serious point for all that, and one that will cost us dear unless some fresh spirit of equity be infused into the whole Anglo-Indian administration. Yet, Mr. Ghose concludes, "the cause which more frequently leads to miscarriage of justice is one which it is in the power of the Government or the legislature to rectify if it chooses, and that is the combination of judicial and executive functions." The weighty meaning of these words may be gathered from Mr. Ghose's explanation and from the examples we have cited above from Mr. Mazoomdar. The power of the High Court to call up and revise the record of all criminal cases no doubt exercises a most salutary restraining influence upon the judiciary throughout the country. But the dependence of judges and magistrates on the Executive for promotion and preferment has a disastrous tendency to sap the very foundations of justice; and the increasing tendency of the Executive, even in high places, to bring pressure to bear, directly or indirectly, upon the judiciary, not even excepting the judges of the High Courts, is of the most ominous import.

Why, then, should this obnoxious system not at once go by the board? It is, in fact, a reversion to a bygone stage of development. Originally, the collector of a district united in himself the civil, the criminal, and the fiscal functions. Lord Cornwallis, in 1793, took away the civil functions. In 1833, largely through the exertions of Raja Ram Mohun Roy, revenue work was assigned exclusively to special deputy collectors and assistants. In 1839, the judicial and executive functions of the magistrate-collector were separated; and in 1843 deputy magistrates were created for the relief of the district magistrates. But the baleful union of functions was re-established in 1858; the collector was reinvested with magisterial powers, and the deputy collectors and the deputy magistrates were amalgamated into the subordinate executive service. The urgency of the Congress has been so far successful. One viceroy at least has openly declared his sympathy. Sir Richard Garth, late Chief Justice in Bengal, has given the reform the weight of his opinion and warm advocacy. Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley, Secretaries of State, both regarded the reform as important. Lord Kimberley declared the system to be "contrary to right and good principle." Yet there it stands to this day, a discredited anachronism in full operation!

What is the reason of such a preposterous state of things? Said Lord Kimberley: "though the proposal is most desirable, yet Government is unable to entertain it, as it would require double the staff at present to do so." In the present state of the Indian finances, the objection of cost stops everything—except scientific frontiers and superannuation allowances. But the financial objection in this case is simply factitious. "As my friend, Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., of the Bengal Civil Service, now Commissioner of the Orissa Division, has shown," says Mr. Ghose, "the reform could be carried out without costing an additional rupee to the State." But even if it involved some additional cost, the saving could be effected elsewhere with immense advantage to the country. Sir Richard Garth did not hesitate to say plainly that the principal objection to the reform lay in the apprehension of executive officers that it would lower their prestige. Lord Kimberley, of course, could not accept that view. But Mr. Ghose, on the contrary, declares: "I am convinced, from what I have seen, heard, and read, that Sir Richard Garth was perfectly right in his assertion, and that the financial objection is merely put forward in the present embarrassed state of Indian finances in order to shelve the question." Shall the question be thus ignominiously shelved?

IV.—By J. Dacosta.

The independence of the judicial bench needs no advocacy in this country, seeing that it is universally admitted to be a main factor in the development of England's prosperity and the mainstay of her welfare and greatness. Impartiality in a judge is scarcely possible when influences are exercised from powerful quarters tending to induce him to deliver his judgment otherwise than in accordance with his conscience and his lights. This proposition might seem a truism. But it acquires great significance in the light of the lamentable facts which Mr. Manomohan Ghose, of the Calcutta Bar, mentioned in his interview with a representative of this journal in November last, and in his address at a meeting of the East India Association in December, when he invited his audience to discuss the subject of judicial independence in India. The facts narrated by Mr. Ghose brought to light the existence of a corrupt system under which the miscarriage of justice in India, owing to the interference of the Executive in the administration of the law, and the undue pressure exercised over judges and magistrates, is of daily occurrence. Mr. Ghose's *exposé* of the manner in which, after a hundred years of British rule in India, justice is dispensed in that country, must cause deep disappointment and sorrow to all who cherished the delusion that the principles of fairness and the high standard of morality which distinguish our tribunals at home were upheld in the law courts established by us in our Indian Empire.

The abuses and gross irregularities denounced by Mr. Ghose are, of course, not revelations, for they must be known to all Englishmen who have resided in India out of the Presidency towns, and also to those at home who have sought information as to how our Indian administration is conducted. Flagrant cases of injustice, oppression, and spoliation have, on appeal from our Indian courts, been heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and been reported in the home papers, especially in law publications, and the *Law Magazine and Review* has in recent years[1] contained articles fully in unison with all that Mr. Ghose said at the interview and the meeting mentioned above. Mr. Ghose, on those occasions, did not confine himself to denunciation. He suggested a remedy for much of the evil exposed by him, by saying that magistrates of the second and third classes would in a great measure be freed from the restraint which prevents them from pronouncing decisions in accordance with their judgment and conscience if the Executive officer of the district (who is also the Revenue collector) were divested of the appellate and revisional powers which he exercises over the magistrates in question, and if those powers were vested in the District Judge who is directly subordinate to the High Court. Mr. Ghose has practiced with remarkable success for nearly thirty years as a barrister of the High Court of Bengal, and his opinion on matters connected with his profession is therefore entitled to great respect. It is gratifying, moreover, to find that the reform suggested by him met with the entire approval of Sir Lepel Griffin, who presided at the aforesaid meeting, and whose experience and successful career in the Indian Civil Service likewise entitle his opinion on matters of Indian administration to the respect and attention of the public. The suggested reform seems well calculated, by weakening the Executive officer's power of interference, to strengthen the judicial independence of the magistrates who are now subordinate to him. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the Executive officer, in using his power of interference, acts under the immediate inspiration of the Government, and that if his utility to the Executive in that direction were diminished, the Government would find no difficulty in discovering or creating some other channel through which to control the decisions of the magistrates whom the proposed reform might liberate. The evil springs from a higher source than the action of the Indian officials mentioned by Mr. Ghose. The Governor-General in Council himself acts under the control of the Secretary of State, and what prospect can there be of independence being secured to the Judicial Bench so long as the Executive powerfully contends against such independence, with the knowledge and sanction of that Crown Minister who, while he admits the necessity of reform in the interests of justice, pleads financial difficulties as a bar to it and, at the same time, squanders millions of Indian revenue every year in waging unprovoked and unsuccessful wars of conquest?

[1] May and August, 1892; February and November, 1892 and 1894; and February, 1895. See also the reports of the proceedings of the Indian National Congress *passim*.

THE BETRAYAL OF KAFIRISTAN.

By An Ex-Diplomatist.

There can be no doubt that every member of the present and last Government is personally sorry for the mistake that has been made in "handing over" the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush to the tender mercies of the Afghans. Still no steps are taken to undo the great wrong that has been committed, and that will brand England for ever in history. There is no difficulty in pointing out to the Amír that we can only make over to him the external relations of Kafiristan, in case that country, or rather its retired and practically lost tribes, ever have any, say, with Russia, he occupying towards Kafiristan the position which we hold towards the independent tribes of Bajaur, that of controlling their external relations without any interference in their internal affairs. Kafiristan has never formed part of Afghanistan. It is also not on any possible strategical or military line. Its people are by race, religion, and language entirely different from the Afghans, against whom they have defended their liberty and lives for 1,000 years, before England took for herself the Amír's kindred, the Pathans of Bajaur, etc., that really belong to the Amír, and gave him in return, under the Durand treaty, what was not ours to give, the heterogeneous tribes of Kafiristan. If this interpretation of the Durand treaty is impossible, it would suffice plainly to tell the Amír, who avowedly values the friendship of the British people so much more highly than that of the Indian Government, that we could never have meant, as an anti-slavery nation, to "hand over" for extermination and enslavement our kith and kin, our good friends, "the brethren of the Europeans," the white men of the Hindu Kush. Nor can there ever be a sincere and lasting friendship between England and a slave-raiding nation; much less can England allow such a nation to be officially or diplomatically represented in this country. Why this harmless concession has not been made to the Amír in return for sparing Kafiristan when we go out of our way to call his an "independent Government" passes our comprehension, for the Amír would, of course, be represented in London by an Afghan, who could give us more insight into Afghan feelings and politics than a host of Pynes and Martins, or even Durands, could ever do. Reverting to the now progressing inroads on Kafiristan from south, north and west, we have not only helped on this shameful *battue* of practically defenceless men by our subsidies of money and of the most modern weapons of destruction; we have not only shown the Afghans how to construct a military road into the Kafir mountain recesses when we demarcated the Asmar boundary, but we have also legalised their slavery proceedings, even beyond the authority of a treaty that, like a dark crime, is still kept a secret from Parliament and the public, which should insist on its publication. We have allowed the Amír to proclaim a Jihád, or "holy war," against the Hindu Kush Kafirs by the same man, the Mulla of Huda, Nizamuddín, who proclaimed one against the British Kafirs some time ago. Now every captive taken in such a war is lawfully a slave according to Muham-

madan law, and so it is the special shame of England to have legalised what, even in the Muhammadan religion, is a wrong generally. We may, however, add that the Amír has given the Kafirs the option between becoming Muhammadans and being exterminated or enslaved. If the Kafirs are what they were in 1866, when they preferred burning themselves to death rather than become Muhammadans, they will not avail themselves of the chance of saving their bare lives, for we very much doubt, with the existence of so many Muhammadan slaves in Afghanistan, whether much of their liberty or property would be left to them in any case. Above all, do the Church Missionary Society deserve to be congratulated on having paved the way for the adoption of Muhammadanism, as usually happens with Christian missions among heathens? The Kafirs received the agents of that society with hospitality, and even with enthusiasm, and it is disgraceful that they should now be left in the lurch, even if it be not true that in the interior of Kafiristan or among the Kafirs there still exist vestiges of an ancient Christianity. A Nero would melt at the fate in store for the Kafirs, and of which even extermination or enslavement is not the worst feature. We fear, however, that there is as much hypocrisy in the religious world as there is a want of humanity, of sagacity, and of the required special knowledge among ministers, who, to avoid trouble or the study of questions committed to them, invent the words "prestige" and "policy" in order to conceal their ignorance and incapacity. At the same time, there can be little doubt that there is a policy in "making over" Kafiristan to the Amír, as there was in inventing the Kashmir suzerainty for Chitral and then using it practically to annex Kashmir, as also its present dependencies, for ourselves. Already in August last the *Standard* was let into the secret. It said: "Under the terms of the recent agreement with the Amír Abdur Rahman, Kafiristan is regarded as lying outside the immediate sphere of British influence, and should the Amír resolve to extend his power in this direction, there will be nothing to hinder him beyond physical obstacles to the advance of his troops. Yet it is impossible not to feel some regret at the fate which would seem to be in store for the Kafirs. Their forcible conversion to Islam would entail much unmerited suffering; and would, at the same time, obliterate the last traces of a civilisation, such as it is, and of a social system which, if there is not very much to admire in it, presents many features of extreme interest to the student." On the 14th September following, the *Standard* allowed a little more of "the policy" to be perceived. There it would seem to hint at the desirability of the Amír of Afghanistan being reduced to the dependent condition of Kashmir, a feudatory who is not subsidised, but who bought its "independence" (see Treaty of 1846). "Kashmir is controlled much more completely and effectually than Afghanistan." Indeed, as "England can command the experience of experts like the Under-Secretary of State, who can boast of a personal acquaintance even with the more obscure details of *any problem that may require solution*" (the italics are ours), he may be able to square the Afghan circle by reducing it to the proportions of Kashmir. "In fact," the evidently inspired writer goes on to say, "Kashmir" (with which, *nota bene*, Afghanistan is significantly compared) "stands in the same relation to the British Government as Bokhara or Khiva to the Government of the Czar." If so, then woe to Afghanistan, for the Bokhara Prince has asked to be relieved of all sovereignty and to retire on a pension to Europe, though not to Dorchester House. The special disgrace of the matter consists in the fact that, in the face of the avowed policy of Viceroys, and Parliaments, and Secretaries of State, the inner "policy," that was represented at one end by the Durand at the Foreign Office and at the other by his brother the Durand at Gilghit (with Dr. Robertson and Captain Younghusband to inspire Mr. Curzon and Lord Roberts), has simply had it all its own way, whether it be with Hunza-Nagyr, Chilás or Chitral, or now, we fear, with unhappy Kafiristan. What, also, could exceed the mismanagement of a recent princely visit which was to strengthen the existing bonds with an Oriental State? "Such are the men that cause war between two nations," was the remark of a prince regarding the man who was appointed to pamper and bully him alternately in this country. *Absit omen!*

THE INDISCRETIONS OF SIR C. ELLIOTT.

BY A. NUNDY.
Secretary to the Gorakhpur Congress Committee.

The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal is a much abused man, but he deserves credit for the courage of his opinions. He may be wrong-headed, he may be above seeing that sometimes what he says must sound ridiculous to others, or that it may not be politic to give expression in public to some of his private opinions. But he frankly lays bare his mind, regardless of consequences. To some extent, therefore, we are under an obligation to Sir C. Elliott. His latest utterance is, however, too startling. At a farewell dinner given to him in Calcutta by the Civil Service he is reported by the correspondent of the *Times* to have "pronounced against the principle of the public censure of officials." "It obtained," he added, "nowhere else but in India where it was the more unnecessary because of the efficiency of the Civil Service. It lowered the prestige of the Service and should therefore be avoided." Sir C. Elliott raises a good many questions. Is it true that nowhere but in India officials are subject to criticism? Is the Civil Service really as efficient as he would have us believe? However efficient a Service may be, is it desirable that it should not be liable to criticism? Does a Service necessarily lose in prestige if its official acts are criticised by the public? No responsible politician in England, if he had any regard for his reputation, would ever think of propounding such startling propositions.

Sir Charles Elliott seems to have a special facility for getting into awkward positions, from which the Viceroy or the Secretary of State has to extricate him as best they may. If the feat is impossible, they are compelled to throw him over. I am re-

minded of an incident which occurred five years ago when the National Congress was holding its meetings in Calcutta. It was brought to the notice of the Subjects Committee that some members of Sir C. Elliott's household had expressed a desire to be present at the Congress. The Committee decided, as a matter of courtesy, to send them tickets of admission, and the tickets were accordingly sent. What then happened might have been dismissed as merely entertaining, but that it was really serious in its consequences. The tickets might have been accepted by those to whom they were sent, who could have attended the Congress, or a note acknowledging the receipt of the tickets might have been sent without the recipients gracing the Congress with their presence. But Sir C. Elliott thought this a good opportunity to administer a snub to the Congress. The day after the tickets had been sent a notification appeared in the Calcutta newspapers which ran thus:—

"Notice.

"The Congress.—The Bengal Government having learnt that tickets of admission to the visitors' enclosure in the Congress pavilion have been sent to various Government officers, has issued a circular to all secretaries and heads of departments subordinate to it pointing out that under the orders of the Government of India the presence of Government officials even as visitors at such meetings is not advisable, and that their taking part in the proceedings of any such meetings is absolutely prohibited."

This was not all. The recipients of the tickets returned the tickets with the following letter, which will speak for itself:—

"Belvedere, 26th December, 1890.

"Dear Sir,—In returning herewith the seven cards of admission to the visitors' enclosure of the Congress Pavilion, which were kindly sent by you to my address yesterday afternoon, I am desired to say that the Lieutenant-Governor and the members of the household could not possibly avail themselves of these tickets, since the orders of the Government of India definitely prohibit the presence of Government officials at such meetings.—Yours faithfully,

"P. C. Lyon, Private Secretary.

"To J. Ghosal, Esq.,
"Sec., Congress Reception Committee."

The reader will, no doubt, have been struck by the difference between the terms of the orders of the Government of India as given in the Notification and in the letter to the Secretary of the Congress Committee, for both of which Sir C. Elliott was responsible. In one, the presence of Government officials as visitors is said to be not advisable while their taking part in the proceedings is prohibited. In the other, even the presence of such officials is definitely prohibited. The Subjects Committee, amongst whom were then present Messrs. W. S. Caine, C. E. Schwann, and George Yule, decided to bring the matter before the Congress, and appeal to the Viceroy. Mr. George Yule delivered a vigorous and stirring speech, and proposed the following resolution:

"That this Congress, having observed with surprise a notice, apparently official, in various Calcutta newspapers which runs as follows (here the above Notification is quoted), and having also considered a letter addressed by the Private Secretary of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal to the Secretary of the Reception Committee (here the above letter is quoted), authorises and instructs its President to draw the attention of His Excellency the Viceroy to the declaration contained in these papers, that Government servants are prohibited from attending any meetings of this Congress, even as spectators, and to enquire most respectfully whether His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has, or has not, correctly interpreted the orders of the Government of India."

This Resolution was duly forwarded by Mr. P. M. Mehta, the President of the Congress, to the Viceroy who, it is an open secret, at once consulted the Secretary of State for India, and, Mr. Mehta having in the meantime left Calcutta, sent the following reply to Mr. A. O. Hume:

"19th January, 1891.

"Dear Sir,—I am authorised by His Excellency to say that Mr. Lyon's letter of December 26th, in which it was stated that the orders of the Government of India definitely prohibit the presence of Government officials at such meetings, and the circular in which that letter was communicated to the heads of departments under the Bengal Government, were issued under a misapprehension as to the purport of the orders of the Government of India, that the letter in question went beyond those orders, and an amended circular, in which it was pointed out that the expression 'absolute prohibition' had reference only to the participation of Government officials in the proceedings of a political meeting, was subsequently issued by the Bengal Government to the heads of Departments;"

Then the letter added:

"The movement is regarded as one of those which in the words of the circular (referring to the Government of India circular of March 18th, 1890) are perfectly legitimate in themselves and which private persons are free to promote, but from participation in which Government officials are, for the reasons specified in the orders, necessarily debarred. The Government of India recognises that the Congress movement is regarded as representing in India what in Europe would be called the more advanced Liberal party, as distinguished from the great body of Conservative opinion which meets side by side with it.

"(Signed) P. C. Ardagh, Private Secretary."

Sir C. Elliott was certainly thrown over in this instance by his official superiors, and I doubt not that, if in regard to his latest pronouncement as to the impropriety of Government officials being subjected to public criticism, the opinions of the Viceroy or the Secretary of State could be elicited, it would be found that these authorities would repudiate, or at least modify to a great extent, what was said by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

BRITISH OPINIONS ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE.

The current number of India contains the report of an interesting interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose on the relations between the Indian Judiciary and the Indian Executive. Mr. Ghose, now in England on a short holiday, is one of the leaders of the bar at Calcutta, and was the first native of India called to the English bar. He readily acknowledges the purity with which justice is administered throughout India, and the respect in which its administration is held. But he points out that some high officers of the Indian Government, notably Sir Charles Elliott, have shown a dangerous tendency to interfere with judicial independence. Sir Charles has not concealed his opinion that in India magistrates and judges ought to be for all purposes regarded as members of the Executive. A more perilous doctrine it would be difficult to conceive. As Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir Charles

Elliott was responsible for a Bill limiting the right of trial by jury which Lord Kimberley compelled him to withdraw. It may be necessary that in India, as here, magistrates should act in two capacities, should at one time direct the police in putting down a riot, and at another time sit to try rioters. But such a system should be restricted, and not extended. Mr. Ghose cites cases in which native magistrates have been rebuked by British Commissioners for acquitting prisoners, in one instance where the prosecutor actually admitted that the charge was untrue. The judges of the High Courts, though nominally holding office at the pleasure of the Crown are, Mr. Ghose acknowledges, practically independent, though even they have come into collision with the Executive. The district judges are liable to Executive comment, and the native magistrates appear to be as subordinate as policemen. The attention of Parliament might usefully be drawn to the whole subject.—*Daily News*, December 2nd.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose was closely followed by his audience at the East India Society's rooms yesterday, as he put before them in a singularly lucid and dispassionate speech the case for the separation of the executive and judicial functions in India. His charges were that the subordinate magistrates were subjected to constant pressure from the district magistrates—who are also executive officers; that the constant reversal by judges of the High Court of sentences made under this pressure amounted to a scandal, and that the judges of the High Court themselves were by no means free from executive censure and criticism. Mr. Ghose confined himself to his own knowledge of what was happening in the Bengal Presidency, though this thoroughly bad and mischievous system is at work throughout India, except in the Presidency towns. There was a remarkable consensus of opinion in the discussion which followed. Mr. Bhownaggree, M.P., speaking from personal experience, pleaded strongly for the freedom of the judiciary. Sir Roland Wilson, who was Reader in Indian law at Cambridge for thirteen years, spoke of the utter impossibility of training civil servants for two careers in the short time allowed. Several native speakers added their testimony. And finally Sir Lepel Griffin, who was in the chair, speaking as one who had held high office in India, declared in favour of Mr. Ghose's proposal. It is a pity that Lord George Hamilton was not there, for the great weight of Anglo-Indian opinion is still dead against a most necessary reform.—*Daily Chronicle*, December 4th.

TORIES AND THE COTTON DUTIES.

The Secretary of State for India will receive to-morrow an important deputation from Lancashire on the subject of the Indian cotton duties, and the Prime Minister will receive one on the subject of the British beer duties. Lord George Hamilton's position is not a pleasant one. But for that he has himself to thank. His letter to the Tory candidate for the Accrington Division, just before the polling in that constituency, is probably without a parallel in the case of a Cabinet Minister charged with the interests of a vast community. In refusing an invitation to speak at Accrington against Sir Joseph Lesse, Lord George declared that his opinions had been expressed in the House of Commons four months before, and that they remained quite unchanged. Those opinions were that the duties on the importation of cotton goods into India were not required by the condition of Indian finance, that they were a tax upon Lancashire for the benefit of India, that India was supported by the British taxpayer, that they were demanded for protective purposes by the millowners of Calcutta and Bombay, and that Sir Henry Fowler, in consenting to them, had been made the tool of Indian Protectionists. He added that Lord Salisbury, who had been Indian Secretary, agreed with him in every particular. When Lord George Hamilton made this astounding deliverance he was not acquainted, otherwise than through Sir Henry Fowler's speech, with the views of the Indian Government. But when he wrote his letter he was Secretary of State, and must have known them very well. "My appointment," he further told his correspondent, "ought to do you good," or words to that effect. It did the Tory candidate no good, because Sir Joseph Lesse was returned. It did Lancashire no good, for the duties remain as before. It certainly did India no good, and we really cannot suggest the name of any class, or of any person, to whom it did good, except Lord George Hamilton himself. Even Lord George Hamilton must learn something in office. He would, we presume, no longer contend that the expenses of Indian administration, including his own salary, were defrayed from the Imperial Exchequer, or that the cotton duties were paid by the Lancashire producer and not by the Indian consumer. A man with a more sensitive conscience would have refused to hold office an hour after discovering that the duties could not be repealed. He may try to put the deputation off with a promise to modify the duties when they can be shown to operate unfairly against the English manufacturers. But his visitors, if they know their business, will not allow him to wriggle out quite so easily. Of course, the duties must be altered if they are protective. The principles of British finance require it, and Sir Henry Fowler gave a distinct pledge that, if necessary, they would be. But that did not satisfy Lord George Hamilton and his friends. They voted for turning out the late Government rather than submit to the duties, and Lord George has declared, on his official authority as Secretary of State for India, that while they oppress Lancashire India does not require them. They are straightforward people in Lancashire, and they do not understand this kind of thing at all. With Sir Henry Fowler they knew where they were. He and his colleagues risked the loss of the Lancashire vote because they considered themselves imperatively bound to restore the financial equilibrium of India. At the same time, Sir Henry Fowler insisted, against the strenuous remonstrances of the Indian Government, upon a countervailing excise to prevent English goods from being handicapped in the Indian market. Now that is a plain and intelligible policy. Anybody can understand it, whether he agrees with it or not. What is the policy of Lord George Hamilton, with whom Lord

Salisbury concurs? Both in and out of office he has denounced the duties altogether.—*Daily News*, December 10th.

The Lancashire deputation had its interview yesterday with Lord George Hamilton, and begged that the Indian import duties on cotton might be repealed, or that at least their sting might be drawn. We hope Lancashire will carefully study the answer. If it tells us nothing about the duties, it tells us everything about Lord George Hamilton. In just eleven months he has finished such a portrait of himself as cynics like to draw of the typical shifty politician. On February 21st Lord George Hamilton told the House of Commons what he then thought of these duties. First, "the tax was an unfair tax as far as Lancashire was concerned." Secondly, its imposition was "dangerous to the stability of our government in India." Thirdly, it was a tax in which the protective element could not possibly be suppressed by any countervailing duty of Indian Excise. "For his part, he disbelieved altogether in the efficacy of an Excise duty for the purpose." Finally, the voice of India was not in favour of the tax. He ridiculed the notion of being influenced by the voice of Bombay. "If they wanted to hear the voice of India, Bombay and Calcutta were not the places where they could hear it. Those Europeanised cities did not represent India." That is the Lord George Hamilton of February 21st. And here is the Lord George Hamilton of yesterday afternoon. "You have alluded," he told the deputation, "to the fact that the Indian Government have unduly consulted the Bombay Chamber of Commerce and merchants upon their legislation. But," he added, "you must recollect that the cotton merchants at Bombay were the only persons whom the Indian Government could consult on a question of that kind." Is it an offence to consult Bombay in February and a piece of political sagacity to consult her in December? If Bombay and Calcutta were the last places where the voice of India was to be heard last winter, how comes Bombay to be the only place where the voice of India has been audible this autumn? But the year has made even greater changes than this in Lord George Hamilton. In February he flatly denied the necessity of imposing the duties. Now, he says, "that financial exigency exists. It was for the purpose of establishing an equilibrium in Indian finance that these duties were imposed." And yet he believes that "since they were imposed the position of Indian finance has slightly improved." So that, while there was no necessity for the duties when Indian finanee was at its worst, there is a necessity for them when its condition has improved. The desperate remedy which he scouted when the disease was at its worst he gravely declares to be necessary when the violence of the disease is abating. Last February he was all compassion for Lancashire. He denounced "the unwisdom and unfairness of putting the whole burden of sustaining the solvency of the Indian Government upon the shoulders of an already very depressed industry." The unwisdom and unfairness are quite forgotten now. It is simply "the financial exigency exists." In fact, vice has been turned into virtue when the doer has been converted from a Liberal into a Conservative Government. The act that was unjust to Lancashire and perilous for India when it was sanctioned by Sir Henry Fowler becomes an inevitable concession to "financial exigency" when the assent is that of Lord George Hamilton. There is a still worse side to the matter. At the general election Lord George Hamilton sought to gain Lancashire votes by giving it to be understood that as Secretary for India he would be willing and able to carry out the policy which he advocated as an Opposition speaker. On February 21st he told the House of Commons that his view of the duties was shared by Lord Salisbury. Lord Salisbury too, it was given to be understood, believed that the duties inflicted injustice on Lancashire and danger on India, and that the injustice could not be avoided by any countervailing duty of Excise. When the general election came on, Lord George Hamilton, already in full power over India, bade Lancashire think what this speech meant and vote accordingly, "My views on the extra duties," he wrote, in a letter to be used in the Unionist canvass at Accrington, "are stated in a speech of mine I made this spring in the House of Commons, and my appointment to India ought in consequence to help in your election." Lancashire voters were to believe that if they kept the new Secretary at the India Office he and the Premier, whose support he declared that he had, would abandon all attempts to patch up the injustice by means of countervailing duties, in whose efficacy he "disbelieved altogether;" they would relieve the Indian Government from the "danger" which it had incurred, disregarding the voice of "those Europeanised cities," Calcutta and Bombay, and would repair "the unwisdom and injustice of putting the whole burden of sustaining the solvency of the Indian Government upon the shoulders of an already very depressed industry." What could this mean but immediate and total repeal? Lord George Hamilton had vehemently presented the case for repeal, and he told Lancashire to remember that fact. Since presenting it he had passed from the position of advocate to that of judge, and he told Lancashire to remember that fact too, and for her own sake to keep him on the bench. Imagine the effect that would have been exercised on the Lancashire elections if he had written to Accrington, not what he did write last July, but what he said yesterday—if the Unionist candidates had had nothing better to paper the walls with than "Unfortunately a financial exigency for the Indian import duties exists," and "I say very frankly to you that I do not believe, even if it were possible for us and in our power to repeal these cotton duties, that it would at once bring to you all the prosperity which you anticipate." That would have been honourable, whether wise or not. But it would have been unprofitable, and it was not done. With the active concurrence of almost every Unionist candidate for the county, and the quiet connivance of men reputed so fastidious as Mr. Arthur Balfour himself, Lancashire was induced to part with her political goods on grossly false pretences. The whole shifty business is exposed now, and it offers one of the most ignoble spectacles of political misconduct that has been seen in this country for many years.—*Manchester Guardian*, December 12th.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

ELEVENTH SESSION.

MEETINGS AT POONA.

Poona, Dec. 27.

The Tenth Indian National Congress opened here to-day with much enthusiasm, under the Presidency of Surendra Nath Banerji. Sixteen hundred delegates attended, as well as about 4,000 visitors from various parts of India.

The Chairman of the Reception Committee said that the Congress had completed its first cycle of ten years, and entered upon a second cycle with greater strength, authority, and force, and could not be ignored.

The President's Address was of an exhaustive character. The Congress, he said, now demanded modest reforms in the Administration leading to the greater happiness and contentment of the people. The aim of the Congress was to assist the Government, not to revolutionise it. The Administration needed liberalising and placing on broader foundations. He emphasised the necessity for holding competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service simultaneously in England and India. He hoped that the English people would soon return Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to Parliament. He regretted that the scope of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure now sitting in London did not include the question of the policy regulating expenditure so far as it was productive of no good to the country. —*Reuter*.

Poona, Dec. 28.

At to-day's sitting of the Indian National Congress the opinion was strongly expressed that no good would come from the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, of which Lord Welby is chairman, unless the policy regulating the expenditure was inquired into; and, further, that the proceedings of the Commission should be conducted with open doors. The real source of financial embarrassment, it was held, was the "appalling Military and Home Charges," and not exchange. This, it was declared, had now been acknowledged by expert authorities.

The subject of the proposed legislation to restrict the finality of jury verdicts was next discussed. It was affirmed that the projected retrograde changes in a jury system which worked well were viewed with alarm and distrust, and that the popular voice was dead against any such modification.

Dealing with another subject, the Congress declared that the extensive engagement of Indians in the higher offices in the Government service was not possible unless effect were given to the House of Commons' Resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations in India and England.

The occupation of Chitral was condemned as the outcome of an unjustifiable frontier policy overriding Parliamentary statute, and it was maintained that Indian interests demanded that, where expenses were incurred in execution of the Imperial policy of Great Britain, the Imperial Exchequer should bear a part thereof.

The sittings of the Congress are to conclude on Monday.—*Reuter*.

CONFERENCE OF INDIANS IN ENGLAND.

On Saturday, December 28th, a number of Indians met in conference, at Montagu Mansions, Bloomsbury. The meeting discussed the following resolution:—"That this conference considers the reform and expansion of the supreme and local legislative councils by the admission of a considerable proportion of elected members, and the creation of similar councils in the Punjab and Central Provinces as absolutely essential; and holds that all Budgets should be referred to these councils for adoption." Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who presided, said they were to consider a subject of very great importance, which, as British subjects, ought to be specially interesting to them. He hoped the matter would be calmly considered. (Cheers.) Mr. M. A. Ghani, in moving the resolution, expressed his pleasure at seeing Indians and Englishmen gathered together for the consideration of this deeply interesting question. (Cheers.) At present the Indian subjects of the Queen had not the slightest hand in the administration of the affairs of their own country. They who were born in that country were claiming, if not a predominant, at least an equal share in its government. At present they had not a shadow of anything like self-government. Giving as reasons why there should be a reform in the election of councils, Mr. Ghani went on to say that if the laws were passed in the country with the consent of its people, they would have no cause to complain of those laws. If the Government were in touch with the feelings and desires of the people of India, its position would be strengthened. He asked the meeting why the authorities should not make use of the administrative ability which existed in India, instead of importing it all at a great expense. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Balfour had stated that India was conquered by the sword and would be held by the sword. But it was held by the sword of India, for where would the British power have been during the Mutiny had it not been for the splendid loyalty of some of the India peoples? (Cheers.) They owed England a great debt of gratitude for the spread of Western ideas. They did not want a parliament for India. All they wanted was a fair share in the selection of members for the Legislative Councils, which should have consultative and not dictative or executive functions. (Cheers.)—Mr. Ghaswalla seconded the resolution. He pointed out that the elective principle in government was not unknown in India, as it had existed from time immemorial in the village communities, and was even now working well in some of their municipalities. The Anglo-Indians were the real obstacles to reform. He appealed to the people of Great Britain to come to the assistance of their Indian fellow-subjects, and help them to obtain some of the blessings of self-government which had done so much for Englishmen. (Cheers.)—After further discussion the resolution was carried.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of India cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to India (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with India, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of India can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., Trinity Street, Cambridge; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

India presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JANUARY, 1896.

THE ELEVENTH CONGRESS.

"Of all the many acts of injustice which have "marked the conduct of the Government of India of "late years, there is," wrote Sir Richard Garth last spring, "none in my opinion which can at all com-"pare with their insolent treatment of the Indian "National Congress. There is no subject, I con-"sider, upon which the English press and the "English public have been so cruelly and per-"sistently misled by the Government party." Sir Richard Garth wrote these words neither as an ignorant amateur nor as a Radical revolutionary. As Chief Justice in Bengal he had ample opportunities of estimating the value of the Indian National Congress while, as regards the general direction of his political sympathies, he has declared himself to be at least as strong a Tory as the late Sir George Chesney. Of that departed worthy we need only say that his invective provoked from Sir Richard Garth a rejoinder as complete as the most ardent supporter of the Congress could wish. It was said of the Congress by ignorant or malicious detractors that it represented a class apart from the people of India, and that its proceedings were mischievous where they were not merely silly. Sir Richard Garth, on the contrary, proved, what everybody who had studied the facts knows perfectly well, that while the Congress is courageous, patriotic and loyal in its aims, it is thoroughly representative in its composition. Sir Richard Garth examined in particular the statistics relating to the Congress held at Allahabad in 1888. The delegates numbered 1,248, and they were directly chosen by more than three millions of constituents. "The constitu-"tion of this important body was thoroughly repre-"sentative; it consisted of Princes, Rajas, Nawabs, "fifty-four members of noble families, members of "Council, honorary magistrates, chairmen and com-"missioners of municipalities, fellows of universi-"ties, members of local boards, and professional "men, such as engineers, merchants, bankers, "journalists, landed proprietors, shopkeepers, "clergymen, priests, professors of colleges, Zemin-"dars, and others." While the Congress delegates were thus drawn from all ranks and professions they were no less representative of the varied religions of the Indian people. Muhammadans and Hindus, Jains and Christians met together in common assembly to formulate the wishes of a people who, whatever may be their differences of race or creed, are at least united by a common interest in good government and national prosperity. Since 1888 the Congress has become not less but more completely representative of the Indian people. Its influence and its activity are steadily growing, and there are grounds for believing that the attitude of individual officials towards it is becoming more sane. "It "seems to me," wrote Sir Richard Garth in the article from which we have quoted, "that, so far "from being in any way objectionable, the Congress "affords an open, honest and loyal means of making "the views and wishes of the most intelligent section "of the Indian people known to the Government. "We want no secret societies either here or in "India." Sir W. W. Hunter spoke to the same effect last November. The Congress, as he truly said, is essentially the child of British rule, the product of our schools and universities. We have created and fostered the aspirations which animate the Congress, and it would be both churlish and unwise to refuse now to those aspirations both our sympathy and our respectful consideration.

We have not yet before us a full report of the eleventh Congress, which met at Poona on December 27th. The president, Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji, is, as the *Indian Spectator* says, nothing if not a popular leader, a politician of undoubted sincerity and zeal, and a brilliant and persuasive orator. Reuter's telegram, which speaks erroneously of the Poona Congress as the tenth, instead of the eleventh, says that sixteen hundred delegates attended on the opening day, and that there were some four thousand visitors as well. These figures are in themselves

significant proof of the vitality of the Congress movement. It has, as the chairman of the reception committee said, completed its first cycle of ten years, and entered upon a second cycle with increased strength and authority. It is to be regretted that the preparations for the Congress were somewhat disturbed by differences of opinion between those of its supporters who are, and those who are not, advocates of social reform. For some years it has been the custom of the Congress to extend its hospitality to the Social Conference. The Congress building has been placed at the disposal of the Conference either on the day following the meetings of the Congress or, when a Sunday has intervened, in the midst of them. On the present occasion some opposition was offered at Poona to this customary arrangement, and a dispute ensued which, although its consequences will, we trust, be neither serious nor lasting, all British sympathisers with the Congress must deeply deplore. Some days ago it was announced that the leaders of the Social Conference had, in view of these differences, decided not to ask on the present occasion for the loan of the Congress building. We are not, at the time of writing, aware whether this decision was final. But, if it was, we trust that circumstances will never again arise in which it may seem to be expedient. It may be doubted whether any single thing could be more detrimental to the Congress than the growth of a belief that its supporters were for the most part opposed to social reform. Undoubtedly they are not. The opinions of the majority are all the other way, and the recent dispute was, to a great extent, there can be little doubt, personal in its origin. But it should not be repeated. Even the appearance of hostility to social reform, or of competition between the National Congress and the Social Conference, gives cause to the enemy to blaspheme. We trust that the harmony of the Poona Congress will not have been disturbed, nor its influence diminished, by any circumstances arising out of what seems to have been really a local and personal dispute. Nothing, certainly, can impair the intrinsic importance of the subjects with which the Congress was invited to deal nor of the wishes to which it may be expected to give utterance. The group of questions connected with Indian Finance, the cotton duties, the Royal Commission and trans-frontier aggression are hardly more grave than questions relating to freedom of voting in the Legislative Councils, to the rules in respect of interpellation and discussion on the budget, to the new punitive police legislation, or to the proposed restrictions on the finality of juries' verdicts. Upon these matters as well as others the Congress will, before its meetings terminate, put forward representative opinions that will merit the attention of all who are concerned for the welfare of India.

THE GREAT MOGUL.[1]

Dr. Holden, who dates from the Lick Observatory, Mount Hamilton, tells us that this charming and useful volume is the result of his reading in the original memoirs of the native historians of India and in the accounts of early ambassadors and travellers to the court of the Great Moguls, simply to while away the spare hours of a long and harassing winter. It was a fortunate chance. He found that, as judged by these memoirs and accounts, the representations of the personages in question in the ordinary books of reference were inadequate and frequently incorrect. By-and-by there came into his hands a collection of miniatures of the Mogul Emperors, some of which are copied in this volume and add largely to its value and interest. The natural consequence was to piece together representative extracts, with a running commentary of criticism. Hence the volume is in no sense a history of the three centuries from Tamerlane, but a free and easy companion volume of illustration, which is at the same time sufficiently complete to stand by itself. It is just the kind of book that is most likely to attract fresh students to the careers of the Mogul Emperors, and to the later history of India.

To most people, no doubt, the Mogul period is little more than a name; "its impulses are alien, its note is foreign, and its history seems remote." There remains, however, a fundamental interest in tracing the changes of feeling that came over the great sovereigns during those three eventful centuries, and the alterations worked out in the condition of their subjects. The personal characteristics of the great rulers are perennially attractive to historical students, and it is to these that Dr. Holden directs his main attention. The comparisons he indicates, from time to time, between the kings and the peoples of the East and the West, are in the highest degree interesting and instructive. "The writings of Oriental biographers," he says truly enough, "require to be worked over into a new shape before they are acceptable to Western readers." The great thing is to gain the ear and the eye of the Western public for serious consideration of the historical development of the great Indian dependency.

Dr. Holden commences with Tamerlane the Great, whose career at once furnishes a test of his historical sympathy and critical acumen. He certainly stands the test with remarkable steadfastness. To illustrate the position of Timur, he quotes from the friar De Rubruquis, whom Saint Louis of France sent on an embassy to the Grand Khan of Tartary just after the middle point of the thirteenth century, more than a hundred years before the characteristic activity of Timur. "What is most surprising," he observes, "they met with Nestorian and Jacobite priests in numbers; with fugitive Russians, Greeks, Hungarians, Muhammadans, in plenty; a Knight Templar, a French goldsmith, William Bouchier, of Paris, and his wife, 'a woman from Metz in Lorraine,' and even a strayed Englishman." This, he remarks, affords

[1] "The Mogul Emperors of Hindustan, A.D. 1398 to A.D. 1707." By Edward S. Holden, LL.D. (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co. 10s. 6d.)

an explanation of the variety of arts known in Samarcand in the reign of Batu, the grandson of Chengiz-Khan:

"The tolerance of Chengiz and his sons had ceased under Timur, and the Muslim *mollahs* ruled in all religious matters. But the arts of the architect, the goldsmith, the armourer, the weaver, had already been transplanted to these wilds from Europe, from China, from Africa, from Arabia, from Persia. Astronomy, mathematics, poetry, learning of a sort, were cultivated, and the field was prepared for that remarkable advance in some of the arts (notably in architecture) which marks the period of Timur and his immediate successors."

An embassy from King Henry III. of Castile to Timur, in 1403-6, enables Dr. Holden to picture the court of the great warrior king, though not very vividly, and to give one of those striking comparisons that form such a valuable feature of his commentary:

"Perhaps the most striking idea to be obtained from the narrative is that the intellectual superiority of the envoys to the Moguls (which we unthinkingly and at once assume) is less marked than one might have expected. Timur's officers do not seem especially rude and ignorant as compared with the Spanish gentlemen. Timur's court was not a mere assembly of his officials. It was organised in a fashion as orderly as that of the Spanish King. . . . Timur himself was a far more important figure than any of his Western contemporaries."

To complete the view of Timur, Dr. Holden outlines his life as told by the native historians, samples his maxims of government, and essays to reconcile these liberal-minded precepts with the known facts of his career. This is a very able and serviceable endeavour. As he says, "it is of immense interest to know that this absolute ruler even cared to appear to posterity as an enlightened king." And he concludes that, "great as was his genius and success as a captain, we are forced to give an equal admiration to his intelligence as a ruler." Timur's own explanation of his objects in coming to Hindustan, and of the motives that prompted his intention "to exterminate the idolaters of China," are sufficiently curious from the Western and modern view. The comparison indicated by the death of Chaucer less than five years before the death of Timur is full of suggestion.

The succeeding emperors are treated with like thoughtful care and discriminative illustration. Babar's military activity and his personal virtues stand out in prominence, and Dr. Holden applies himself to read certain puzzles in his history. This is his conclusion:—

"Two sayings of Babar's, placed side by side, give the key to all his public actions. 'Inspired as I was with an ambition for conquest and for extensive dominion, I would not, on account of one or two defeats, sit down and look idly around me'; and again, 'How can any man of understanding pursue such a line of conduct as, after his death, must stain his fair fame? The wise have well called Fame a second existence.'

"The circumstances of Oriental and Western life are totally dissimilar. 'Between us and them crawls the nine-times-twisted stream of Death.' If we can make the needed allowances for these differences of time and circumstances, Babar will appear not unworthy to be classed with the great Cæsar as a general, as an administrator, as a man of letters. His character is more lovable than Cæsar's, and reminds us of Henry IV. of France and Navarre. He conquered India and founded a mighty empire. Take him for all in all, he was the most admirable of the Mogul kings."

Babar fulfilled the highest Turki ideal; he had "prudence, knowledge, energy, ambition and generosity—qualities from which nobility draws its name." His son, Humayun, spent his whole life in agitation or in exile, having too much of the milk of human kindness for the vigour necessary in his circumstances. The successive raids, sieges, captures, flights of his reign "read like the annals of a band of Sioux."

"But the wars in Europe at the same epoch, were they materially different? We forget that modern war began with Napoleon's campaigns. And as to the barbarous tribes, do we not find almost exact parallels in the cruel revolutions in South American states even to-day? In Chile? In the Argentine? In Brazil? In Honduras? There are no prisoners taken. The corpses of the dead are terribly mutilated. The captured cities are looted, and their inhabitants inhumanly outraged."

Humayun set before himself three principles of conduct in all circumstances: "First of all, integrity of design; then, energy in action; and, finally, moderation in success; ascribing all the glory to an over-ruling Providence, and nothing to the merits of man." It was the second that he too often failed to carry out in practice. "His renown has suffered," Dr. Holden points out, "in that his reign came between the brilliant conquests of Babar and the beneficent statesmanship of Akbar; but," he concludes, "he was not unworthy to be the son of the one and the father of the other."

It is not necessary to follow the illustration. Yet it is tempting enough. The sketch of Akbar the Great is admirable; and, by this time, Dr. Holden finds, "the blood of Timur had been thinned so that it ran calmly in the veins of a great statesman and a good king, and the lust of mere conquest was replaced by a sincere desire for 'the happiness and prosperity of the husbandman.'" Very attractive, too, is the sketch of Jahangir, with the account of Sir Thomas Roe's mission to the Emperor's court. "It is easily to be seen that the real success of Sir Thomas's mission was due to his personality, and not to the fame of England or to the value of his gifts;" and "that Sir Thomas Roe, a modern Briton, was continually and unconsciously comparing the Emperor Jahangir with his own English king, not always to the advantage of the latter." A charming chapter is devoted to Nur-Mahal (the Light of the Palace), "whose reign was nearly contemporaneous with that of King James I. of England, the successor of Elizabeth, and who may fairly be compared with that great English queen."

"If we think of the contemporaries of the Indian Empress, we shall not find her equal. We are forced to go back to the great Elizabeth for a term of comparison even. While she lived, Nur-Mahal was the greatest personage in all Asia, if not in the whole world."

For Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb the work of Bernier is laid under contribution. The Taj-Mahal is mentioned, as being the tomb of the wife of Shah Jahan —"a dream in marble, designed by Titans and finished by jewellers." "The Ruin of Aurangzeb" is a reprint of Sir W. W. Hunter's masterly sketch of the downfall of the last of the great Mogul Emperors.

The *Times* stated on December 17th, that the Amír Abdur Rahman had decided to reduce to submission the mountain state and people of Kafiristan. "All the necessary arrangements have been made to commence operations as soon as the passes are open, and," the *Times* added, "the Amir has satisfied himself that he will meet with no opposition from the Government of India in carrying out what has long been one of his most cherished designs!"

DITTICISMS.[1]

"STONY-HEARTED reviewer" has become a proverbial phrase, and like many proverbs it conveys a germ of truth. It is in fact an illustration of what the serious call the natural law of adaptation to environment. Some of the tasks of the reviewer require the "heart bound round with oak and triple "brass" of Horace. His it is to venture on perilous voyages, and warn the unwary general reader of the dangers and trials that beset his course. It is only a sense of the essential loftiness of his mission that nerves him for the reading of such volumes as "Divers Ditties," by Mr. A McMillan M.A. The title is unfortunately chosen. It at once suggest comparisons with "Departmental "Ditties" which in spite of Kipling "boom" and Kipling "slump" remain the truest and most humorous sketches of Anglo-Indian life yet published. Nor does the preface greatly reassure the reader. There we learn that most of these verses have appeared in the poet's corner of the Allahabad *Pioneer*, one set in the *Literary World*, and another, "Bonnie Bell," in *London Society*. The author expresses a hope that English readers will take an interest in the numerous types of Anglo-Indian which he endeavours to portray, and enumerates them. Surely it was rash enough to invite comparisons by his choice of title, without directly challenging Kipling on his own ground by labelling his characters with names and descriptions already familiar to readers of "Departmental Ditties." Messrs. Thacker and Spink could have assured Mr. McMillan, if they chose to give him information about their sales, that English readers do take an interest in Anglo-Indian types. But we very much doubt whether that interest will take the form or go the length of creating a demand for "Divers "Ditties." Acting apparently under the influence of the same Até that prompted the publication of the volume, the author gave first place to twelve pages of wilfully comic verses entitled "Anundorum "Borooah," an elaborate attempt to chaff one of the few Indian Civil Servants who have succeeded in overcoming the obstacles placed in the way of native competitors by a jealous Government. The effect of this production, meeting the reader on the very threshold, is to fill him with a foreboding that the author has with his Scotch name got little or none of that enviable gift, Scotch humour, and a superfluity of that terrible drawback to literary charm, Scotch wit. The impression is confirmed by a more extended perusal of the book. "Alun "Aheer," a poem free from all affectation of ponderous wit, and "The Civilian Obadiahs," the metre of which lends a certain lightness to the matter, may be exempted from the general condemnation, although towards the end of the latter the author's deficiency in that sense of contrast which forms so large a constituent of true humour leads him into a painful bathos. At last with patience exhausted we feel inclined to applaud Mr. McMillan's prayer on p. 5:

> "May vengeful Heaven strike me dumb"

or to accept without question his explanation on p. 12:

> "I feel that not by slow degrees
> I grow beyond all hope insane"

and again to give in our adherence to his description of the newspaper that published these versicles as

> "The evil speaking *Pioneer*."

It is more especially in the explanatory footnotes that Mr. McMillan's wit, freed from the trammels of metre, flaunts itself in all its beauty. Here is an instance: "The information contained in horo-"scopes," writes this acute Master of Arts, "is not "always very exact, and, so far as exact, not always accurate." The slender difference of meaning between the two words is an unsafe medium for a funambulatory display of Mr. McMillan's genius, and he comes down heavily. In some cases he shows great consideration by enclosing the point of the joke in square brackets lest the incautious reader, stumbling upon it unawares, should hurt himself. For example: "Spins. Unmarried and "[more or less] marriageable ladies are called spins "in India—short for spinsters." Or take this remarkably apposite reflection of an autobiographical nature:—

> "Their own dear selves did much delight,
> And [sometimes] pleased their audience too."

This at once suggests the reason for the writing of "Divers Ditties," if not reasons for their publication. But for the latter proceeding, too, motives may be found on purely internal evidence, and, having so far quarrelled with the author, it is only fair that we should put on record the points in his work in which we fully concur. They are these:

> "The poet pines for laurelled fame
> His cankered brow to bind,
> His quest is but an empty name
> That fleeteth as the wind."

> "Song of the Spin, a long way after the 'Song of the Shirt'."

> "And the meed that labour and merit have missed,
> Falls to a fortunate dunce or drone."

But is that any reason why a presumably honest man should try to take advantage of fortune's blindness by publishing the productions of a too little occupied leisure?

If we appear to take too severe a view of a work which, in spite of some prejudiced opinions on Indian matters, is harmless, and shows here and there some traces of merit, it is because we believe that while there is room in literature for third-rate prose, if, like a late Professor's, it is valuable for the information it embodies, no verse can endure or be endured which is not excellent of its kind and perfect in manner. Such work is not altogether out of place in the columns of a penny paper or even an ephemeral magazine where it may pass unnoticed. But the claim to rank as literature which is implied by its issue in book form, beautifully printed and bound, is a claim that cannot be too emphatically denied. The minor poet is the canker of modern literature. If Mr. McMillan had

[1] Divers Ditties, chiefly written in India, with appendices by Alec McMillan, M.A., Bengal Civil Service (retired). (Westminster: A. Constable and Co.)

ever dined with a deaf old gentleman, and been forced to repeat for the latter's benefit his best after-dinner witticism that had set the table in a roar, he would have found in the faint indulgent smile which greeted its third repetition an object-lesson illustrating the difference between sparks thrown off in the clash of conversation and the steadier flame necessary to illuminate permanent productions. Many a wit has ruined his reputation by publishing, and we can quite believe that the author of "Divers Ditties" has had some reputation as a wit. Finally, we have one word of comfort for Mr. McMillan. In a ballad entitled "On the Road to Pepityapore"—once more we join issue with the author on the presumptuous choice of a title—he says :—

> "But often in camp when the day's work is sped,
> As I sit by my fire with the stars overhead,
> Old memories pondering o'er,
> I think of the lass with the dark beaming eye,
> And swear to hold dear till I drivel or die,
> That sweetest of hours by the tamarind high,
> On the road to Pepityapore."

Let Mr. McMillan be comforted. He is absolved from his oath. He has drivelled.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Major-General Sir Edwin Henry Hayter Collen, K.C.I.E., as Military Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India, in succession to Sir Henry Brackenbury, whose tenure of the appointment expires in April next.

Mr. Bertram Currie, who was appointed to the Council of India in 1880 for his special knowledge of financial subjects, ceased to be a Member of the Council on December 11th, by the operation of the Act which forbids any further extension of his tenure of the appointment.

Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart, governor of the Chelsea Hospital, has been reappointed to the Council of India for a further period of five years. This mark of favour from the Government will (said the *St. James's Gazette*) give great satisfaction in India, where Sir Donald won his honours, and for the welfare of whose army he has worked with incessant vigour on the Council since his first appointment in 1885. It is interesting also from the fact that Lord George Hamilton has not allowed Sir Donald's views on the Chitral question to put an end to his usefulness on the Council. Sir Donald was one of the staunchest supporters of the Chitral policy of the late Government, since reversed by the present Administration. The Council now consists of ten members, and there is some speculation as to whether the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Bertram Currie will be filled up, differences of opinion prevailing as to whether the Council need exceed the statutory minimum of ten.

Those who, like ourselves (wrote the *Westminster Gazette*) cannot accept the so-called forward policy in India will be glad to see that it has been decided to reappoint so experienced a trans-frontier soldier and opponent of further annexation on the north-west as Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart as member of the Council of India for a further period of five years. But what about Mr. Balfour's assertion that all those who are against the forward policy are unmindful of the "honour" of England? Why, then, honour Sir Donald?

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Stephen George Sale, barrister-at-law, to be a judge of the High Court at Calcutta, in the room of Mr. John Freeman Norris, Q.C., who has been permitted to retire.

Mr. Chamberlain has cancelled the regulations under which competitive examinations for colonial cadetships have hitherto been held, and the Civil Service Commissioners have agreed that examinations for these appointments shall in future be held simultaneously with the examinations for Class I. clerkships in the Home Civil Service and for the Indian Civil Service, under regulations identical, so far as the subjects of examination are concerned, with those prescribed for the Class I. and Indian Civil Service schemes. The change will come into effect at the examination to be held in August, 1896, if any vacancies for colonial cadetships are then offered for competition. It is to be hoped that India will be credited with a fair share of the saving which will thus be effected.

A banquet was given on St. Andrew's night, at the Holborn Restaurant, to Mr. Moolraj Bhagwanani, "who, as the foremost son of the native State of Khairpur, has been the first to achieve success as a scholar, graduate, and barrister." Mr. Moolraj Bhagwanani is the son of the Minister of the State of Khairpur, and was sent to England by the late Amír to qualify himself for the highest post in the State. A distinguished company assembled to do him honour on the eve of his departure from London, including Judge Bagshawe, Professor Murison, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

It is satisfactory to have to record that Indian questions are exciting increasing interest in England. Besides the meetings which are usually held at this time of the year by the East India Association and the National Indian Association, two other meetings were held in the first week of December, one in connexion with the Balloon Society, and the other a drawing-room meeting at the house of Miss Toynbee. At the latter an amusing incident occurred, showing the length to which some Anglo-Indians will go. Mr. K. Connell was the chief speaker, and gave an interesting address on the subject "How India is Governed." His account was, on the whole, fair and impartial, but, as was pointed out by Mr. A. Nundy, who was called upon to reply to him, so long as Mr. Connell confined himself to facts, no exception could be taken to his observations; but where he ventured to express opinions, he went wrong.

Mr. Connell, in the course of his address, referred to Mr. Crouch, an Anglo-Indian who was present, as a greater authority on Indian matters than himself, and wound up his speech by declaring that it was an undoubted fact that British rule in India was a great blessing to the people. Mr. Nundy, who followed him, whilst fully appreciating the good

results of British rule in India, contended that it was not an unmixed blessing, for from personal experience he could say that all except the money-lending classes had been impoverished, as a natural consequence of a policy which necessitated the heavy drain of fifteen to twenty millions sterling per annum from India to England. This statement was more than Mr. Crouch could stand. Addressing the meeting, he laid it down that anyone could see for himself that all classes of persons in India were more prosperous now than they were in former times, and as to the enormous drain of money referred to by Mr. Nundy, he was strongly of opinion that the greater the drain of money from a country, the greater was its prosperity. This remark provoked considerable merriment, which was resumed when Mr. Connell, in his final reply, threw over Mr. Crouch, whom he had referred to as an authority. Mr. Connell could not have done otherwise. He has himself written some very interesting papers on "Indian Pauperism: its Causes and Effects," and he holds decided views on the consequences of this heavy drain of money from India to England.

A drawing-room meeting, at which a large number of European and Indian ladies and gentlemen were present, was lately held at the house of Lord Hobhouse, when Mr. Manomohan Ghose gave an interesting address on social progress in India during the last thirty years, and pointed out that it was a fallacy to suppose that the people of India were at a standstill in their ideas upon social and domestic matters. He confined his remarks entirely to the Bengal Presidency, and adduced facts which go far to absolve Bengalis from the reproach, constantly levelled against them, of caring more for political advancement than for moral and social reform.

On December 9th, at the Balloon Society, an animated debate took place on a paper read by Miss Müller, entitled "Anglo-Indians in India." The opener of the debate, whilst giving Anglo-Indians full credit for their good intentions, deprecated the roughness of manner and the absence of sympathy towards Indians on the part of a good many Englishmen, and hoped that both races would in future try to cultivate more kindly feelings towards each other—a view that was endorsed by other speakers who followed her.

At a meeting of the London Indian Society, held on December 14th, Mr. A. Nundy spoke on the subject, "Was the Government Justified in Occupying Chitral?" After referring to the policy of the Government of India, after the mutiny, as one of non-intervention with any of the frontier chiefs, and of masterly inactivity, Mr. Nundy discussed the incidents that led to its reversal by Lord Lytton, who first initiated the policy of aggrandisement and extension. The posting of British agents beyond the Indian frontier, the speaker contended, necessarily led to complications and events which the Government of India was quick to resent as acts of insult or aggression. Primarily, the Government was responsible for the events which led to the Chitral campaign, and under any circumstances there was no justification for the occupation of the country on the grounds (i) That it constituted a direct breach of the proclamation issued at the time of the advance of the British troops; (ii) That, as the expedition was of a punitive nature, it was unnecessary to occupy the country; (iii) That it imposed on the people of India an unnecessary and cruel burden both in the expense of the expedition and in the expense attendant on retention; (iv) That the country was barren and without any resources which could be developed; and (v) That the occupation of the country would lead to further complications and afford fresh grounds for aggression on the part of the British Government. A lively discussion followed, and the sense of the meeting was, as might be expected, against the policy of occupation.

LORD HOBHOUSE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Lord Hobhouse has played a conspicuous part on the Imperial stage. Yet he does not regard smaller duties as fit only for those who have not been rulers over ten cities. When the newly formed London County Council chose him as an Alderman in 1888, he accepted the office, and for some time worked heartily as Chairman of the Corporate Property Committee, and as a member of various other committees. Failing health and the influenza are answerable for his retirement from London's Parliament. As he himself says: "A man might give up all his life to the work of the County Council, and do little else, so absorbing is it." Yet Lord Hobhouse is still a vestryman, interested as a lawyer in the legal affairs of Marylebone and just now in the revision of the Vestry bye-laws. As the clock neared noon he informed me that Vestry work was awaiting his attention.

It need scarcely be said that Lord Hobhouse is a judge of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that he is a K.C.S.I. and a C.I.E., or that for five years he served in India as Legal Member of the Supreme Council of the Viceroy. Lord Hobhouse sailed for India in 1872.

"Lord Mayo," he said in reply to my first question, "was Viceroy when I was first appointed, but his assassination in the Andaman Islands quickly followed, so that my appointment practically coincided with that of Lord Northbrook. These five years were rather a quiet time, a period of rest following one of unusual legislative activity. Both Lord Northbrook and I were advised by the Secretary of State that we hardly required much fresh legislation."

"But of course it would not be true to say that nothing of great importance happened whilst you were in India?"

"There are always important administrative matters in India of which you hear nothing in England. As Law Member of Council, I had constantly to advise my colleagues in such matters from my point of view. You may see the multitude and variety of topics by glancing over these volumes, which contain a portion of my notes and minutes. The greater part of my work was of the executive kind. On the Legislative side it was my business to

superintend every measure, and to pilot most of them through Council. Perhaps the most difficult and laborious one was the remodelling of the Civil Procedure Code. But though I was the mouthpiece for it, and in the last resort responsible for its contents, the hardest part of the work was done by Mr. Whitley Stokes, the Secretary of the Legislative Department and my successor as Law Member, a draftsman of rare skill and ability, and equipped with great knowledge of the subject."

"Was any effort made to ascertain native opinion?"

"Yes, such as our position allowed. All points of importance were submitted to the provincial authorities, who in their turn consulted such Indian gentlemen as were likely to give useful opinions—a very poor substitute for the searching public discussion of England, but the best we could get. And our first proposals were often modified, sometimes abandoned, under its influence."

"From the purely legal point of view, I suppose, it is an advantage as regards the actual passing of measures to work under non-representative institutions, as there is less need to wait upon public opinion?"

Lord Hobhouse shook his head emphatically. "No, no; a very grave disadvantage. You may seem to move on faster, but what does that matter, if the ground is not sure under your feet? Under a despotism, you do not know where the people are, you grope in the dark. You wonder what they think of a measure, whether it is in advance of public opinion, and if so, how much; you have not the guidance of representative bodies."

"The organisation known as the Indian National Congress is believed to help officials to ascertain the state of opinion. Do you agree with its policy?"

"I must confess that of recent years Indian affairs have not so much occupied my mind as they perhaps ought to do. I have more and more devoted such energy as I have left to affairs at home. But naturally I regard any change or movement without ascertaining public opinion as dangerous, and it seems to me the Government of India should welcome any help that such a body as the Congress can give them. So far as I can learn, its leaders have shown ability and moderation."

"It seems to have provoked abuse from the Anglo-Indian press."

"When I was in India the English papers I saw struck me as being ably and temperately conducted. But since our system has brought so many active, ambitious and educated Indians to the front, I suspect some feeling has arisen, and I dare say, expressed itself. But mind, I do not profess to judge of this, as I do not read Indian papers."

"Still, you have observed the recrudescence of the 'forward' frontier policy?"

"I am afraid that I hold unpopular opinions upon it, as I am opposed to the 'forward' policy. I shared Lord Lawrence's views on the subject. I became acquainted with him on my return to England; and worked with him to try to prevent the Afghan War in 1878. My views on the frontier policy were formed when I was little more than a boy, during the first Afghan Wars from 1838 to 1841. I then saw, and nothing has occurred to make me change that opinion, but everything to confirm it, that a 'forward' policy is full of danger and difficulty. Your frontier must be somewhere. An empire extended by conquest does not mean strength, but the contrary. And extension of territory is a costly business, both in war and in the administration which follows. The expense of organising newly acquired provinces is heavy, and in the present critical condition of Indian finance this is a consideration of the first importance. My conviction is that with contented Indian subjects no attack from outside need alarm us, even if anybody threatened it, and nobody has, that I know of. I think that we are incurring the real and great dangers of insolvency or over-taxation to meet the imaginary danger of invasion. Also that we meet it in the most blundering way, by extending our frontier, and holding posts further and further from our true base, the sea, and from the populous parts of India whence we draw our resources."

"The wonder is how that policy of unceasing advance ever came to be begun. Since you saw its unwisdom at an early age, surely there were men in England who perceived the dangers it entails?"

"Some statesmen opposed it, of course, but the naval and military and semi-military men of all countries favour conquest, and override their opponents. They are very strong in India. Then, in 1838, Lord Palmerston was Foreign Secretary. He vigorously waved the British flag, and was possessed by jealousy of Russia, which was very unreasonable, I have always thought."

"I remember reading a forcible memorandum which the Queen sent to Lord Palmerston on his failure to consult her sufficiently in the matter of foreign despatches."

"Yes, he was afterwards dismissed, but had to come back. His popularity was very great. He was not Foreign Minister when the Crimean war broke out, but his influence would be on that side, and during the war he became Premier. But whether we think Lord Palmerston right or wrong in his aggressive hostility to Russia, he was a most efficient man, and a thorough master of his business. Later we had Disraeli for Minister, who appealed to the same feelings of jealousy of Russia when the second Afghan war broke out. He followed Palmerston's game, but with far less ability and knowledge. But there I am touching upon disputed topics, nor can I compress into a sentence what requires an essay. To me nothing is clearer than that aggrandisement spells weakness, and raises up difficulties with our neighbours, consuming our energies in allaying them."

"Was it not Matthew Arnold who said that the French lack morals and the English lack intelligence? Perhaps we don't understand our real interests."

"I don't know that the French understand theirs any better. They insist upon colonising when they have not the necessary surplus population. They took Tunis, which has been nothing but a source of showy weakness to them, much as Egypt is at this moment to ourselves."

"You spoke a moment ago, Lord Hobhouse, of the ambition of Young India. Do you think there is anything in the native character likely to prevent Indians from exercising power wisely?"

"Of course, the Indians are mostly conquered peoples, and have been so for many centuries; and that position has a tendency to stunt certain qualities which conquering and free peoples possess—for example, the quality of command and the readiness to undertake responsibility. But I am not a believer in race, as some men believe in it. I mean, I see no vast difference such as would entitle one race always to rule and cause another to be ruled. Different races have at different periods shown the qualities that we associate with a ruling race. Sometimes one, sometimes another, has been dominant. Few Indians have had the training necessary for men who are to rule."

"You say that Indians are a conquered race. But is it not true that we conquered one section of them by means of another, and thus gained the supremacy?"

"There is no Indian race, but many races; no nation, but many nations, religions, languages, castes and other divisions, all in discord with one another. That is how we, being solid, prevailed over the vast, incoherent mass. I believe the earlier conquerors, Pathans and Mughals, found the same state of things, and prevailed in the same way. Besides, the ground is not entirely untrodden. We know perfectly well that some Indians can rule, for we have seen, not to go back to Hyder Ali or to Sikh or Mahratta chieftains, men like Dinkar Rao, Salar Jung, Madhava Rao, very able administrators. Even inborn characteristics require opportunity, else development is impossible. The goverment must be worked by means of Indians more and more. I am convinced that this is an absolute necessity."

"You remember, of course, the storm Lord Ripon raised by holding such views. Anglo-Indians protested against the idea that any posts should be given to Indians, except those that Europeans did not consider worth accepting."

"Yes, and if ever a man moved cautiously in the matter, that man was Lord Ripon. The outcry was against the principle of giving any authority to the native Indian—not the first time it has happened in Anglo-Indian history."

"Did you see much of Indian society, Lord Hobhouse?"

"Of course I had business relations with many Indian gentlemen, but in our sense of the word society, there cannot be said to be any between Europeans and Indians. When people cannot eat together, when the ladies of a household cannot communicate with the outer world, there can be none of that free and unrestrained intercourse which you are thinking of when you ask about society. The caste system prevails, even among Muhammadans, and although it is doubtless a powerful cement of the social fabric on a small scale, it is a bar to both personal intercourse, and to action on a large scale. I several times, indeed often, sat on committees with Indian gentlemen, and found a good proportion of them able and thoroughly competent. Several Bengal zemindars struck me as highly educated and well read, and their opinions on subjects known to them were well worth having."

"Were there any Indian gentlemen in the Viceroy's Council in your time?"

"The Viceroy's Council is really two bodies, one is the Executive, on which are seven high state officials, and there is no native of India upon it. When the Council sits in its legislative capacity, there are about twenty members, and in my time three or four of these were Indians. I believe the number is larger now."

C. S. BREMNER.

LORD G. HAMILTON ON THE COTTON DUTIES.

Lord George Hamilton, Secretary of State for India, received on December 11th, at the India Office, a large and representative deputation of persons interested in the Lancashire cotton trade, on the subject of the Cotton Duties. In reply to the deputation Lord G. Hamilton said:

"I felt it my duty, as soon as a general wish was conveyed to me from Lancashire that I should receive a deputation on the cotton duties, that I ought at once to accede to the request, but I believe the majority of you know the conditions under which I expressed my willingness to receive such a deputation. They are contained in a letter, and I think all those who have heard that letter read will understand the reasons why I must now speak with a certain amount of reserve. Several of the speakers have reminded me that this is not the first time I have had the honour to receive a deputation from Lancashire. I went through the old agitation which took place some twenty years or more back, resulting in the abolition of the duties imposed in India, and I am certain that no man who has had the official experience I have had and who has come into contact with representatives of Lancashire ever can pretend that this question is a mere local one, or that those who speak or agitate upon it are influenced by motives either of selfishness or of greed. (Cheers.) I have endeavoured always to look at the question from one point of view and one alone—namely, from the Imperial view—(cheers)—not from the local interests of Lancashire on the one side or of Bombay on the other. Now, it is admitted by every one that, excepting perhaps the ties which race and religion may weave, the bonds of commerce are the most powerful instruments known for knitting together the interests of scattered communities and of welding them together into an empire. But if trade and commerce are so to work they must operate equally for the interests which they touch—(hear, hear)—and whenever it is in any way necessary to adopt a tariff policy which sets great industrial communities in different parts of the world in the same empire in antagonism or collision one with another, then the germs of disunion are created and the stability of that empire is threatened. We all know that, as locomotion and facilities of transport are accelerated and developed, so the power of trade and commerce both in binding and disintegrating communities and empires is increased. Therefore, I have always treasured up the happy words of the present Prime Minister, who, in summing up the controversy twenty years ago, said this was a matter of dangerous contention and it was only under conditions of emergency or exigency that recourse in any way ought to be had to such a policy.

THE FINANCIAL EXIGENCIES OF INDIA.

Unfortunately, as several speakers have admitted, that financial exigency exists, and it was for the purpose of establishing an equilibrium in Indian finance that these duties were imposed. Since they were imposed the position of Indian finance has slightly improved, and I hope it will continue to improve. Reference has been made to members of the Indian Government, and especially to Sir James Westland. Let me say that I have had a great many communications with Sir James Westland, and a fairer, straighter, or stronger man I

have never met. He is bound to look at this question, as Finance Minister, from both sides, and I find no bias or prejudice in his mind; indeed, in one sense, he is your best friend. If an equilibrium can be established between Indian expenditure and revenue, so that these duties can be dispensed with, it is admitted that they are the first tax that should be dealt with. No man has striven harder to effect that end than Sir James Westland, and if in the course of a few years that satisfactory result is attained, it will be more due to Sir James Westland than to any other living man. The principle involved is an important one, and I think some of the critics hardly realise the magnitude of the interests which you represent. Great Britain is the greatest manufacturing and exporting country in the world. I do not know if many people are aware that, taking the returns of the last ten years, the exports of the cotton trade alone comprise twenty-five per cent. on the average of the whole total annual exports of Great Britain. They amount on the average to the enormous total of sixty millions sterling. On the other hand, India is the great receiving market for cotton goods. Its population comprises one-fifth of the human race, and it has taken during the past ten years on the average from thirty to forty per cent. of the total cotton exports of this country. Therefore, the question is one which you are perfectly right in raising in the shape you have done. I have looked at it from both points of view. No one will contend that it is for the benefit of India that the consumers there should pay five per cent. more than they did before; and therefore, if a satisfactory equilibrium between income and expenditure could be established, it would be as much to the interests of India as of Lancashire that the duties should be abolished. It is, as has been observed, almost impossible to draw a hard and fast line through a vast number of varying qualities of goods and say that a tax shall only apply on this side of the line and not on the other. (Hear, hear.) The inevitable tendency of increase on one side is to draw up those on the other in sympathy with it, and therefore the Indian consumer will understand that in the aggregate he pays under this system more for his cotton goods than the Government receive from the duties imposed. Therefore, we are all agreed that if we had the power to dispense with these duties we would gladly do so. There is equal agreement as to the conditions under which the duties were imposed. Sir H. Fowler stated in the clearest possible manner that, in his opinion, the duties were in no sense to be protective. And he was so confident that they would not operate in that direction that he did not consult Parliament before imposing them. The Indian Government have fully accepted the conditions under which alone they were to legislate, and it will be observed that in the circular recently addressed to the Bombay Chamber of Commerce they announced that they intended loyally to adhere to the conditions.

THE ALLEGED DELAY.

Now I come to the main point of the speeches—namely, that there has been considerable and even, as some put it, unwarrantable delay in answering the memorial I received some time back. On that point, I want gentlemen just to bear in mind what are the difficulties of the Council here and the Council in India. These duties have been imposed on the condition that an excise is to fully countervail the import duty. To establish perfect equality is an exceedingly difficult matter. Mr. Whittaker, who is a complete master of every technicality of the cotton business, met my predecessor, Sir H. Fowler, here with others on May 27th. Sir H. Fowler asked them to state in a succinct form on paper their case. It arrived on July 9th. You will see, therefore, that although they were experts, professing a knowledge of all the technicalities of the cotton trade, yet even in drawing up one side of the case they occupied no less than six weeks. I do not think it is unreasonable that the Indian Government, who have to consider not one side only but both sides of the case, and—if we come to the opinion that any alteration is necessary—have to consider what those alterations should be, it is not unreasonable that we should be allowed a little time to mature our answer. I can assure you that, so far from there being delay, as soon as the general election was over I took the matter in hand and have been in constant communication with the Indian Government ever since. Now, you will understand that it would have been easy to have sent an answer very quickly to a memorial of that kind. Whenever a petition or a memorial is addressed to a Government praying for alteration in a tariff, if Government wishes to refuse the memorial they can answer quickly; but if, on the other hand, they believe there is something in the memorial that requires further consideration, and that upon further consideration legislation may be necessary, then the position is changed. It is a cardinal maxim in tariffs that no Government should allow a great interval to elapse between the declaration of their intention and their action upon such intention. You know it is the invariable practice when any deputation waits on the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to any existing tax that they do not get a final answer until he introduces the Budget. Now, we have made considerable advance; and I hope that in the course of a very short time we may be able to give you an answer. To every pledge that my predecessor made, of course I adhere; and I sincerely hope that whatever conclusions we may arrive at may in some way contribute towards the re-establishment of the prosperity of your industry. Mr. Holmes drew attention to the great difference between the amount of piece-goods exported last year and this year, and he seemed entirely to attribute the difference of 22½ per cent. to the action of the cotton duties. But it must be recollected that last year the exports to India were exceptionally high. I believe they exceeded the quantity imported in any preceding year. Stocks were undoubtedly excessive at the commencement of the year, and I have little doubt that these excessive stocks contributed materially to the difference between the exports of this and last year to which attention has been called. But I quite admit the force of one statement made by different speakers. When a trade is in so depressed a condition as the Lancashire cotton trade is, uncertainty as to its future tends greatly to aggravate that depression.

WHAT LANCASHIRE HAS TO FACE.

I have looked at the question perfectly impartially, and I say frankly to you that I do not believe, even if it were possible, that repeal would at once bring to you all the prosperity you anticipate. From the figures relating to the exports of India I find that during the last ten years the value of cotton exports from Great Britain to countries other than India has not increased, but, on the other hand, the exports from the Indian mills during that period have literally doubled, and there is this year a large increase in the amount exported. Therefore, it is clear that quite independently of these import duties, and in places where they do not operate, there is increasing competition between the products of Indian and Lancashire cotton mills. It is better to look the situation in the face. You have to deal with new conditions of competition.

EQUALITY OF TREATMENT.

I have belief in the capacity of Lancashire to adapt herself to almost any condition, provided she has fair play. That fair play you ask from the present Government. They, in common with their predecessors, are pledged to give that fair play, and by fair play I mean prefect equality of treatment. (Cheers.) You ask for nothing more, and, as I understand, Bombay asks for nothing more. You have stated that the Indian Government have unduly consulted the Bombay Chamber of Commerce and merchants upon their legislation, but you must recollect that the cotton merchants at Bombay were the only persons whom the Indian Government could consult. And you contended, I think, that my predecessor in office did not sufficiently consult Lancashire. Well, I am fully in possession of the views of Lancashire. Lancashire wishes certain alterations to be made in the existing tariff. I am bound under these conditions to let Bombay have its full say on any such proposition. Therefore, if I cannot say any more to you than this, I think we can exchange ideas which, to a certain extent, will be satisfactory. You impress upon me the necessity of pushing this matter forward as rapidly as possible in consequence of great damage being done to your industry. I admit that fact is already known to the Viceroy, and I will emphasise it by repeating to him the results of this interview. (Cheers.) On the other hand, I think you will agree that, pending the date at which we can remove these duties, whatever is done now should be done fully, thoroughly, and finally. In whatever spirit any changes may be considered, it must be of an equitable and judicial character. It is essential they should be associated with such a full investigation of every detail of this complicated question that we should not fail in our object, the fulfilling of the pledges we have given. (Cheers.) I can assure you I will do my best to accelerate the

reply and decision of the Indian Government, and I will forward to the Indian Government the substance of the communications which you have made to me, and I am quite confident these communications will be received in a sympathetic and equitable spirit." (Cheers.)

LORD JAMES'S REPLY TO SIR H. JAMES.

Lord James of Hereford, formerly Sir Henry James, Q.C., M.P., delivered at Bury, Lancashire, on November 20th, a farewell address to his former constituents. His remarks included the following passage referring to the Indian cotton duties. The contrast between it and the speech which Sir Henry James delivered in the House of Commons last February is interesting and instructive:—

"There is one question which I know is of great interest to the whole of Lancashire, and therefore, of great interest to you. The textile trade of this great community is at present in such a condition that anything that affects its interests, anything that hampers its free action, must be a matter of acute importance to Lancashire men. Therefore, I am certain you will fully appreciate the view that has been expressed by the representatives of Lancashire, and in a humble way by your former member, and expressed in a far more emphatic manner by your present member, that the existence of import duties affecting the importation of our goods to India, so long as they afford protection, and, therefore, opposition to Lancashire, is a matter deserving of the fullest consideration of the Government. (Cheers.) It is no very difficult task to make clear to those I now address the position which this question now occupies. There can be no misunderstanding, I think, as to the intention of the late Government when giving their sanction to the imposition of these import duties. The late Secretary of State for India (Sir Henry Fowler), speaking in July last year, when answering a question put to him in relation to those import duties, gave the following answer:—'The resolution of the House of Commons of July 10, 1877, with reference to the Indian import duties on cotton goods was to the following effect:—"That, in the opinion of this House, the duties now levied upon cotton manufactures imported into India, being protective in their nature, are contrary to sound commercial policy and ought to be repealed without delay, as soon as the financial condition of India will permit." The resolution deals with duties that are protective in their nature, and I have already stated to the House that, in my opinion, the executive Government ought not to sanction steps which would reverse that decision without giving an opportunity for discussion in this House of Commons. The imposition of duties which would not be protective in their character is not affected by the resolution.' In a debate that took place in February of this year Sir Henry Fowler, representing the Government, repeated that he did not intend to sanction duties that were protective in their character. He offered to meet Lancashire on the subject. Delay occurred through the serious illness of Sir Henry Fowler, but the moment he was able to meet a deputation he met them. I think those who were present know that he then expressed the same view, and he asked that Lancashire should draw up a statement in writing in support of their contention that an import duty, not met with a sufficient countervailing duty, gave protection to the Indian manufacturer as against Lancashire. That statement was drawn up most ably, and it contained arguments, at least, to show that these duties, as they now exist, are protective to the Indian manufacturer, and give him an advantage as against the Lancashire producer. It was pointed out that the countervailing excise duty upon Indian goods was a 5 per cent. duty upon the yarn only, whilst the duty imposed against the British manufacturers was a duty which covered the weaving, the colouring, and everything incidental to the carriage of the goods. I must say that, whilst I have been most anxious since this subject was mooted that it should be exempt from considerations of party profit or advantage—I hope I may say this without giving offence—I think if Sir Henry Fowler had taken a little more open counsel from Lancashire than he did, he would not, at the time when the duties were imposed, have allowed such a difference to exist between the import duty and the countervailing duty. I know Sir Henry Fowler well. I am certain he is a man who would have been true to every word he uttered. He would have kept faith to the fullest extent, and, if he had remained Secretary of State for India, if it could have been shown that there was this difference between the two things, the duties would have been modified. Before the statement arrived at the India Office, however, the late Government, I think, ceased to exist, and the duty of carrying out the views which have been expressed by Sir Henry Fowler devolved upon the present Government. I am in a position to state that the view he expressed against a protective duty, if it could be shown to be protective, is fully shared by his successor, Lord George Hamilton. The representation has been forwarded to India, and the Indian Government has had its attention called to the argument of Lancashire. It has been pointed out to India that if this duty is protective, in the interests alike of India and Great Britain it ought to be modified. (Cheers.) I am sure there is not a person in Lancashire who will not be reasonable in this matter. The Government have not to act as individual men. They are not, as I was in February, a representative of Lancashire stating the Lancashire case. They must act judicially in this matter, and one necessity of judicial action is that both sides of the case should be heard. India has a right to be heard in this matter. (Hear, hear.) She is a vast portion of this great Empire. Her population, I think I am right in saying, represents one-fifth of the population of the world. She is a great market for Lancashire, and anything that causes India to be disaffected, that shakes our moral power in India, will strike a blow against our Empire in every portion. You have no reason to be afraid. As far as I know, the Government of India has never asked for a duty that shall be protective. I am encouraged to hope by one fact that there will be generous treatment of this question by the Indian Government, and that there will be no attempt to support protection, if it be shown that protection does really exist. I may mention to you that there was a 5 per cent. duty on coarse yarns going into Burma. It was pointed out that that duty was protective, and the Indian Government, exercising its own power, when convinced that the duty was protective, reduced the 5 per cent. duty to a merely nominal sum, so that it does not affect the manufacturer here at all. (Cheers.) That which has been done there one may naturally hope will be the principle upon which the treatment of this complaint by Lancashire will be dealt with. Whilst I am certain that justice will be done by the Indian Government, I am happy to think that Lancashire is not unreasonable. I noticed that on Saturday last a convention, as it was termed, of well-known Lancashire men, mostly connected with the textile trades and largely interested in this question, met in Manchester. The demand they conveyed to the Government was that there should be such a readjustment of the Indian excise duties as would deprive the import dutiies of their present protective character, and that the duties should be abolished as soon as the financial position of India would permit. That is a reasonable demand, and for the reasons that I have given to you, unless it can be shown that these duties are not protective, there is every reason to hope that an equitable modification of them will be effected. All that I am entitled to say at present is that there is no reason to doubt that that modification will be promptly brought into effect." (Cheers.)

Reviews.

A SOLDIER OF THE MUTINY.

With H.M. 9th Lancers during the Indian Mutiny. The Letters of Brevet-Major O. H. S. G. Anson. Edited by his son, Harcourt S. Anson. With portrait frontispiece. (London: W. H. Allen and Co., Limited.)

The Letters constituting this interesting volume cover the short period of fifteen months—from June, 1857, to March, 1858. They were obviously never intended for publication, and they derive a special value from that fact. They owe their existence to

the softer side of the soldier, whose thoughts always turned to his wife and children at Kussowlee. When the Mutiny broke out, Captain Anson had already seen some twenty years' service in India, and had done good service in the field at the battle of Puniar, and at Sobraon, in the Sutlej campaign, and at Gujarat and Chilianwallah in 1849. His excellence as an officer and his absolute devotion to military duty are unimpeachable. Yet the cast of his countenance and the tone of these Letters irresistibly suggest that he would have been more fully in his element in charge of some retired English cure of souls. The tenderness of his conscience is indicated in his keen sense of responsibility at those intervals when he was temporarily placed in command of his regiment. His home affections were peculiarly deep and strong. "How much I should like to see dear little C. in her new brown straw bonnet!" he writes from the camp at Fategarh, January 19th, 1858. "How my heart yearns after you all! This separation from you all for so long is, to a man of my temperament, a very sore calamity." He was constantly writing to his wife, often under the most unpromising circumstances. Throughout the Letters the tone is profoundly religious, but always manly. Major Anson bore a part, at times with conspicuous distinction, in the relief of Delhi, Agra, Lucknow, and Cawnpore. His last day's work was twelve hours on horseback in front of Lucknow, on March 6th, 1858. "It strained me all over," he wrote on the 10th, "and I feel something like a wreck." He was presently invalided, but died at Dehra Dun on January 14th, 1859, at the premature age of forty-one. One closes the volume with the feeling of tragedy.

Major Anson was profoundly impressed with the religious aspect of the situation. "There is no doubt," he writes (June 12, 1857, Camp Delhi Cantonment), "that the rod of God is upon us, that men's hearts are failing them for fear, that God is proving us, bringing us into the snare, and laying trouble upon our loins." For (Aug. 27, 1857, Camp before Delhi) "in building up India, we have thought too much of Mammon and too little of God." Again (Sept. 13, 1857, Camp before Delhi): "Prayers will avail more than all the pomp and circumstance of war and our own arm of flesh to secure our ultimate success." Major Anson is greatly shocked at the reprisals of cruelty that frequently occurred, and even at the lengths to which some of our troops carried the license of plunder.

The following passage is thoroughly characteristic: it is dated Feb. 27, 1858, Camp Newelgunge (10 miles from Bunnee).

"I found the house (residence of one of the ministers of the King of Oudh) gutted, and burning—Evans, the Commissioner, with some of his police, and accompanied by those prime looters, F. and E.; having yesterday worked their will on it. F. wanted to present me with a whole handful of little grotesque brass gods and goddesses, and I at first thought that, inasmuch as they could not be well broken, they would be just the things for the children to play with; but, on maturer consideration, I returned the curiosities to him, because they might perchance give an idolatrous turn to the pets, when they saw the servants salaaming to them, and bringing offerings of rice, etc., etc. Don't you think I was right? They were, barring this, such capital playthings that I was sorely tempted to take them."

Major Anson describes in these letters the current events within his own circle, with only the briefest references to outside events. It is extremely curious that the two or three mentions of Baird Smith should be quite unimportant, and that Aleck (Gen. Sir A.) Taylor's name should not (so far as we have noticed) occur in these pages. Sir James Brind once or twice passes across the scene. There are appreciative references to the Lawrences; and a great many details about Sir Hope Grant and General Showers, and Sir Dighton Probyn. Hodson comes in once or twice, and later on Havelock and Outram, and Sir Colin. But these letters can only supplement the general narrative in small details. When Nicholson arrived in camp, there is nothing to indicate his reputation or importance. Perhaps Major Anson assumed ample knowledge in his correspondent. On Nicholson's death, "a great loss indeed he is to the army." The other references of any consequence are worth quotation, as showing Nicholson's temper of mind:—

"I met a crowd of natives on my way to church this morning (Sept. 6, 1857, Camp before Delhi), and Nicholson was in the middle of it haranguing the Europeans, and bidding them for their own interest and comfort conciliate the affections of the Punjabees lately arrived in camp, saying that even the vile refuse who have so deeply revolted from us could and did, as in the instances of the 35th and 26th, appreciate brotherly regard from Europeans; that it was just now of more importance than they imagined to keep on the best of terms with the brave northern levies, and that they were sure to reap the reward of doing so in ensuring their hearty friendship and co-operation in the field. I stopped and listened to him for some time; he has a bad voice, but spoke with good and earnest feeling."

That is a very pleasant glimpse of Nicholson. The next shows him in the fatal street of Delhi:

"I am sorry to say (Sept. 19, 1857) that we failed in an attack on the Lahore Gate, through some unaccountable backwardness of our 8th and 75th who could not be persuaded to advance, though Lieutenant Briscoe, of the 75th, sacrificed himself (being killed by a shower of grape) in a vain endeavour to rouse them. Nicholson's Europeans showed a similar recreancy on the 14th, when ordered to storm the Burn Bastion. He called upon them repeatedly to advance, and, finding that they did not, turned round to harangue them, and had got as far as 'I never would have thought that Europeans would have quailed before niggers,' or words to that effect, when he poor gallant fellow, fell mortally wounded, for the doctors have but very slight hopes of his recovery, the ball having smashed his ribs and sent the bones right into his lungs, causing fearful inflammation."

Those are not the only examples of disgraceful recreancy mentioned. The petty details, however, bring out vividly the daily troubles in camp—the preciousness of a glass of beer, or a cup of tea, or a newspaper, and the discomforts of the heat and the rains and the flies and the decomposing bodies of men and carcasses of animals. The scenes inside Delhi on the capture are in many points vividly depicted. Later, too, Major Anson brings out clearly the embarrassment caused by the protection of the women and children, and more than once he laments over the indiscriminate reprisals. Occasionally he has an eye for the humours, sometimes grim enough, of the situation. Thus:—

"A Sepoy of the 5th N.I., fully armed and accoutred (he had fifty rounds of ammunition in his pouch), came and gave himself up to our picquet yesterday, saying that he was tired of life. He was hung. . . . The rope broke twice; the

second time the bystanders laughed, *and he laughed too.* Three volleys put an end to his existence."

Again:

"On picquet yesterday Evans caught a venomous snake. . . . He made the reptile bite his cap, and then seized it by the back of the neck, and, holding it tight, exposed its awfully sharp and venomous fangs most richly to view. The cool way in which he held it and poked its mouth about amused me much. He is fond of stalking musk-rats round the walls of the house, pouncing on their necks with his finger and thumb with great dexterity. He and Goldie have been amusing themselves with blowing up with powder thousands of flies (Aug. 5, 1857). . . . .

"Evans took the opportunity of going to sleep in a puddle. He is the strongest man I know. Yesterday he was two hours up to his breast in water under a burning sun surrounded by alligators, which he was attempting to catch by their noses. He has only got a slight cold to-day (Aug. 18, 1857)."

Major Anson was under no illusion as to the difficulties in taking Delhi, and offers many shrewd criticisms on his leaders. He reflects also the feeling of neglect from home. On August 11th he writes: "They do not yet appear at home to have their eyes half open to the gravity of the crisis." And on the 27th: "We shall not be, humanly speaking, much indebted to the good people at home for the happy result of our exertions and endurance before Delhi. Their apathy, culpable in the extreme, seems to reign supreme, and they will require to hear the news of the fearful Cawnpore massacre before shaking it off." On August 29th he prospects the new *régime*:

"We cannot do without a small native army, especially on the frontier beyond Peshawar; but the new native army will be as small as we can make it, and there will be no monsters of Poorbeas in it. It will also be much more strongly officered and disciplined, and under the strictest surveillance of an army of Europeans double its present strength. Strong fortifications will be built at the principal stations, and powerful brigades kept as movable columns, ready to march at an hour's notice. This, you will see, will be the new *régime* when the present troubles are over."

If the volume be taken just for what it professes to be, it will be found of much personal and collateral interest.

MYTHS AND FOLK-LORE.

Chips from a German Workshop. By F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M., Foreign Member of the French Institute. New Edition. Vol. IV.: Essays on Mythology and Folk-Lore. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.)

This thick volume completes the "New Edition" of Professor Max Müller's famous collection of "Chips from a German Workshop," and very appropriately the workshop is figured in the frontispiece. The articles date at various periods from 1855 downwards. They deal with Classical, Teutonic, Celtic, Zulu, and Oceanian myths and tales and songs, treating Mythology and Folk-Lore in the widest sense, and the alterations introduced now by the author seldom go beyond mistakes and misprints, although we think that he ought to have made the revision more thorough, without regard to the claims of existing stereotype plates. Here, however, as in the preceding volumes, Professor Max Müller maintains his old positions with tranquil satisfaction. He has re-read his early theories in the light of more recent, widely different, and largely hostile theories, and calmly announces that he has very little indeed to recant. Yet he is indulgent to other explorers of the same field. He acknowledges the persuasive charm of their theories; he is far less inclined now than he was in his more combative days to say that the views of those who differ from him are "altogether erroneous." Yes; "it may seem at first sight very strange that scholars working on the same materials, and all equally anxious, it may fairly be supposed, for the discovery of truth, should have arrived at such divergent, not to say contradictory, conclusions as to the origin and true purport of mythology." Still, "after watching the conflict of opinion for many years," he is at present rather inclined to say: "How could it be otherwise?" He even banters Mr. Andrew Lang with perfect complacency. It is the attitude of the philosophic mind that the years bring with them. The Professor has done his work to the best of his ability, and he is content to leave it to the judgment of the future.

"Truth is in no hurry." That is a great fact, which eager solvers of knotty problems are but too apt to forget. Approaching the mountain from different points, explorers necessarily report different observations, which may eventually turn out to be not discordant but really mutually supporting. There is no reason in the world why the various principles of interpretation should not be worked out independently. The only requirement of science is that every student should labour with a single eye to the truth, and criticise his fellows in the spirit of fairness. On this point, Professor Max Müller has certainly large ground for complaint. It is too absurd to call out Solar Myth when his name is mentioned.

"That there is hardly a mythology without Solar Myths, who would deny? That there is hardly anything else in mythology, who would affirm? Yet, because some of my earliest contributions to comparative mythology were devoted exclusively to the subject of Solar Myths, I have been represented again and again, even by Mr. Gladstone, as a Solarist, as teaching that the whole of mythology is solar. Suppose an astronomer were to write a book on the sun, would he be supposed to have denied the existence of the moon and the stars? Would other astronomers accuse him of ignorance, and claim for themselves the credit of having made the brilliant discovery of the moon and the stars in the sky?"

The remonstrance and the *reductio ad absurdum* ought not to have been necessary. Professor Max Müller, while working on the linguistic basis, has always had "the strongest sympathy for that more comprehensive spirit which animates the analogical and ethnological schools of comparative mythology." Knowing, however, the mistakes to which scholars are liable in analysing Vedic, Avestic, Greek, Roman and Teutonic mythology, after large familiarity with the languages and literature in which such mythology is embodied, he naturally shrinks from a confident handling of the folk-lore of peoples whose languages he has not studied. He enumerates and comments upon the six critical points of controversy put forward on behalf of the ethnologists by Mr. Andrew Lang; and certainly there is in each of these groups of comments serious matter to be answered. At the same time, he is most willing to admit that every one of the six points "contains some truth, and the system, if care-

fully worked, as it has been, for instance, by Mr. Frazer, can produce and has produced very valuable results." The point of quarrel is the representation that the anthropologic system is "the only solvent of mythology in all parts of the world." "That," says Professor Max Müller emphatically, and with justice, "it certainly is not." In regard to the defence of his own position, he deals with the allegation that "etymology is often uncertain, and that comparison has sometimes proved misleading." Thus:—

"Does not the same apply in an even higher degree to the deciphering of Babylonian and Egyptian inscriptions, of Vedic hymns and Avestic Gâthas? nay, to every branch of science that is not absolutely stagnant? Does it not apply even to Physical Sciences, which like to call themselves exact? Does not Weismann differ from Darwin? Were Lord Kelvin and Huxley always agreed, even in facts and figures? Etymologies allow, at all events, of argument: we can produce our reasons for or against an etymology; we are not obliged to submit to mere authority. Those who cannot form an opinion for themselves would naturally keep aloof. Nor would any mythologist trust to etymology and comparison by themselves, without looking for further help and confirmation."

The thing is to get at the *hyponoia*, the thoughts underlying every myth, the reason in all the unreason of mythology. It must be acknowledged that Professor Max Müller has done his fair share of the work of discovery on the lines of the oldest available evidence, the evidence of language. From the preface to the present volume we learn, incidentally, that he has yet another work on the stocks, dealing with points of argument on which scholars have differed from him. He certainly displays a breadth of view and a largeness of scientific conception that are absolutely essential to solid achievement. Whatever dissents may be made from particular opinions, he still holds the field with doughty determination. "With such names as Bopp, Burnouf, Benfey, and Pott, among the ancients, and Darmesteter, Michel Bréal, von Bradke, Oldenberg, Bloomfield, and Victor Henry, among the present generation, to support me, the time has not yet come to strike our flag."

INDIAN STORIES.

Silent Gods and Sun-Steeped Lands. By R. W. Frazer, LL.B., I.C.S., Retired. Illustrated by A. D. McCormick. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

The half-dozen short stories that form this exquisitely printed little volume all deal with variations of one simple theme—the depth of elemental passion or of long inherited superstition in the Eastern mind. The first, "The Tailless Tiger," is a grim story of the murderous revenge of a jealous husband on a Brahman priest. The murderer perishes mysteriously in the forest, killed apparently by the spirit of the dead transformed into a tailless tiger. "The Cry from the River" introduces the belief that strength and stability may be given to a bridge or other building by burying a living person in its foundations. "The Wail of the Woman" tells the mournful story of the daughter of a Brahman priest who ventured, under the protection of English law, to marry, although, as a "child-widow," she was doomed by the law of her caste to perpetual widowhood. "The Last Human Sacrifice and the Abbé Leroux" is the longest and also distinctly the best story in the book. It is based on the superstition described in Volume I of "The Golden Bough" (pp. 384–390), the belief in the magical power of the blood and tears of a human victim to fertilise the land, the blood causing the redness of the turmeric and the tears producing rain. The scene is laid among the wild hill-tribes of the Khonds, and the introduction amongst these of the worship of the lowland goddess Kali is the central point of the narrative. In these four slight, somewhat monotonous, and yet impressive stories, and to a less degree in the remainder of his volume, Mr. Frazer is chiefly successful in conveying to the reader his deep sense of the great mysteries of India—the mysteries of Nature, of wide river and vast hill and pathless jungle, and the greater mysteries of the people, "the wild, silent passion that rages in the hearts" of those whose gods the European has broken in pieces. He paints in truly sombre colours; there is hardly a touch of hopefulness, or even of humour, to lighten the gloom. But he writes with a real endeavour to understand and enter into the feelings he describes. The style suffers from a defect often to be noticed in first books (as this presumably is)—a tendency to overweight the sentences with trailing relative clauses. The interminable relatives of "The House that Jack Built" ought to be taken as a warning rather than as a model. Mr. McCormick's effective illustrations deserve a word of praise; their dim outlines and shadowy suggestiveness admirably reflect the spirit of the narrative.

"TWENTY-ONE DAYS IN INDIA."

Twenty-One Days in India. Being the Tour of Sir Ali Baba, K.C.B. By George Aberigh-Mackay. (W. and H. Allen and Co., Limited.)

Sir Ali Baba spends his twenty-one days in India in calling on a varied circle of acquaintances, from the Viceroy, the "Great Ornamental," to the Indian Villager, by way, of course, of the Travelling M.P. The sketches are light and readable, a decided change from the hackneyed commonplaces with regard to Indian life with which we are so painfully familiar. But they are very unequal, and sometimes spoilt by too obvious a desire to be funny. The characters may be classified broadly as those who are admitted to Simla, those who visit Darjiling, and those who go nowhere at all. By a subtle process of evolution it is possible to pass from the second class to the first. The collector is a case in point. When every illusion as to the desirability of the English climate and the superiority of his English friends has vanished, "when the afternoon of life is throwing longer shadows, the Acheron of promotion is gaping before him, he falls into a commissionership, into an officiating seat on the Board of Revenue. *Facilis descensus*, etc. Nothing will save him now; transmigration has set in; the gates of Simla fly open. It is all over." The last class, it is needless to say, does not evolve. The author is for once serious as he talks of the Indian villager. "Famine is his horizon, insufficient food the foreground. And this is the more extraordinary since the villager is

surrounded by a dreamland of plenty. Everywhere you see fields flooded with millet and wheat. The village and its old trees have to climb on to a knoll to keep their feet out of the gorgeous poppy and the luscious sugar-cane. Amid this easeful and luxurious splendour the villager labours and starves." But even for him there is some compensation. Nature exhibits to him all her charms. "In that mysterious temple of the Dawn, in which we of noisy mess-rooms, heated courts and dusty offices are infrequent worshippers, the peasant is a priest. Day, with its fierce glories, brings the throbbing silence of intense life and under-flickering shade, amid the soft pulsations of Nature, the cultivator lives his day-dream. What there is of squalour and drudgery and carking care in his life melts into a brief oblivion, and he is a man in the presence of his God, with the holy stillness of Nature brooding over him." But such is not the general tenour of the book, which points out in a flippant fashion the unnecessary pomps and vanities, the superfluous quantities of gold lace and chuprassies, which attend the Government in India. The present (twentieth) edition contains some new sketches, which are scarcely up to the level of the rest. It also contains copies of the illustrations from the larger edition, some of which are rather amusing.

THE SECOND JUNGLE BOOK.

The Second Jungle Book. By Rudyard Kipling. With decorations by J. Lockwood Kipling, C.I.E. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

Mr. Kipling has kept his promise, made in the "Jungle Book," and given us another equally delightful volume of stories. It is marked by the same accurate and subtle observation and imaginative force which carries the reader away and adds these beasts of the jungle to the number of his familiar acquaintance. The characters of the various animals are so skilfully depicted that one seems in reading the book to have entered a new Æsop world where the parts are played by the panther, the cobra, and the elephant, and the wisdom they enforce is none the less homely and direct, if a little less obvious, than in the old-fashioned stories. Certainly the brown bear and the panther deserve to be added to the list of those names which have been recalled from vague generality and endowed with personality. Mowgli has become the master of the jungle, whose power all acknowledge, even Hathi the wild elephant. He lives among the jungle people, abiding by their law, to that last law which all must obey, when the drought brings famine and desolation, when the spring comes in which "the *mohewa* tree, that Baloo was so fond of, never flowered. Then, inch by inch, the untempered heat crept into the heart of the jungle, turning it yellow, brown, and at last black. The green growths in the sides of the ravines burned up to broken wires and curled films of dead stuff; the hidden pools sank down and caked over, keeping the last beast footmark on their edges as if it had been cast in iron; the juicy-stemmed creepers fell away from the trees they clung to and died at their feet; the bamboos withered, clanking when the hot winds blew; and the moss peeled off the rocks deep in the jungle, till they were as bare and hot as the quivering blue-boulders in the bed of the stream." The most exciting of all the stories relates the great fight between the wolves and the dholes or red dogs of the Dekkan. The latter are so fearless that every animal quails before them. In a huge pack they wander forth searching for food and slaying all they meet. The account of Mowgli's successful cunning, and the final struggle, is most vividly told. But "man goes back to man at last, though the jungle does not cast him out." The time of new song, and the joy of good hunting, cease to satisfy Mowgli, and he returns to lead the life of a villager. A few graphic touches make us realise with what bitterness of spirit he was forced to leave his old, happy, careless life, and how inevitable it was that he should be so forced. There is also a humorous character-sketch of a crocodile and a jackal, the story of Purun Bhagat whose hero no other country than India could ever have furnished, and a few other stories. The verses scattered at intervals share the fascinating rhythm of most of Mr. Kipling's work of this kind, though none of them perhaps is quite so irresistible as the march of the camp animals in the earlier book.

THE STORY OF THE SEA.

The Story of the Sea. Edited by Q, assisted by Professor J. K. Laughton, H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P., W. Laird Clowes, Herbert W. Wilson, etc., etc. Illustrated. Volume I.: Cassell and Co. (London, Paris and Melbourne, 1895).

All who have had a share in the production of this handsome volume deserve well of the public. The distinguished editor (who is not familiar with the name of that writer of delightful stories and no less delightful *causeries*, Mr. A. T. Quiller-Couch?) and his expert assistants have been generously seconded by the enterprising publishers, Messrs. Cassell and Co., and the result is a harmonious and beautiful compilation which should prove fascinating not only to young men and maidens but also to very many children of a larger growth. "You are an English boy," says the writer of the introductory article, "with good adventurous blood in you, and you are rightly eager to know something of the story of the sea, to examine that inheritance which covers nearly three-fourths of our planet and is perhaps the chief glory of your blood and State. The subject, of course, is really inexhaustible, and nothing short of a grand encyclopædia could pretend to do it justice. These pages do but undertake to give you a lively sketch of the sea, its nature and its mysteries, and of man's high performances upon it." The task is as colossal as it must be exhilarating. The present volume ranges from "Sailing Vessels and their Rigs," to "Tales of Bombardment and Blockade," from "The Pleasures of the Sea: Yatching," to "The Lifeboat at Work." It contains also hundreds of excellent illustrations.

"THE RELIEF OF CHITRAL."

The Relief of Chitral. By Captain G. J. YOUNGHUSBAND (Queen's Corps of Guides) and Captain FRANK E. YOUNGHUSBAND, C.I.E., Indian Staff Corps (Late Political Officer in Chitral). With Map and Illustrations. (London: Macmillan and Co., and at New York. 1895.)

"This book is the joint production of two brothers who are constantly being mistaken for one another." They are at the time of writing both Captains, were both intimately concerned in the campaign of which Chitral fort was the objective, and are now both officers in the Indian Army, though one began his career in the British Service. Captain Frank E. Younghusband, C.I.E, is in the Political Service of the Government of India. Captain G. J. Younghusband is a combatant officer in that noted Punjab corps the Queen's Own Guides. The heroic exertions, the sustained endurance, and the military skill displayed in the several events of which the relief of Chitral was the objective, come naturally under three divisions of the narrative—the expedition sent from India under General Sir Robert Lowe; the defence of the Chitral fort by Surgeon-Major Robertson and the commandant Captain Colin Campbell, with comrades Townshend and Baird; and the amazing march of Colonel Kelly with his 400 Sikh and Kashmir troops, who really raised the siege and relieved Chitral. As to the form of the joint narrative, the skill and care with which it is told is in no respect more manifest than in the success with which these three distinct operations are described without cross references or repetition. The composition is generally excellent, while the brief notices of the striking scenery through which the several actors moved in no way encumber the story, and it goes without saying that the topography and the delineation of the various military operations leave little to be desired. Justice is also done to such plans and strategy as Umra Khan and Sher Afzul had arranged between them, much of this being derived from the information and observations noted by Lieutenants Fowler and Edwardes during their eventful captivity, which was terminated by their well-timed strategic release when the shrewd Pathan chief promoted them from the status of prisoners to that of envoys, with good results to himself. The story of these officers' "treacherous" seizure and rough usage on the polo ground at Reshan, the hardships and perils of their enforced march as prisoners, the sagacity of Umra Khan in his treatment of, and tentative negotiations with, them (pp. 39-52) form one of the less known but more interesting portions of this strange eventful history of the whole conflict in the recesses of the Hindu Kush. Here we may quote the author's epitome of this episode:

"So ended the wonderful adventures of these two British subalterns. At the time when they were holding out at Ruston and making their last stand in a mere village house against overwhelming numbers of the enemy; again when they were treacherously captured by a deceitful foe; and, lastly, when they were in the hands of men in the fever heat of rebellion against the British, no one could have supposed that they could have escaped alive. But they had survived every peril and were now once more in safety among their fellow-countrymen."

Whilst there are decorations and promotions for survivors no one can forget the brave men who were sacrificed in this "brilliant" military effort to redeem the desperate and ill-omened political policy in which this campaign was one of the deplorable incidents. One of the most conspicuous and pathetic of these sacrifices was that of Captain J. McD. Baird in the memorable sortie from the Fort. A fine portrait of him is given in this volume. Captain Younghusband does justice to the gallant young officer (pp. 169-171). He says:

"A week after Colonel Kelly had reached Chitral, Major 'Roddy' Owen and myself, riding on ahead of the advanced parties of General Lowe's force, arrived in Chitral. . . . Late in the evening of April 27th we rode in and had the honour to be the first to congratulate the famous garrison and the officers of Colonel Kelly's force upon their splendid achievements. . . . One of the first subjects on which they spoke to us was about poor Baird. Few officers have ever attached their comrades to them more sincerely than this brave officer, and he was one of the best and keenest soldiers in the service. . . . His coolness was as remarkable as his zeal; and suffering though he was and knowing that he must die he remained cheerful and collected to the last. . . . He gave a few last messages to those at home, and then with a smile on his face, and, thinking of his profession to the very end, wished his comrades success in their plans and bade them good-bye. He died on the morning of March the 4th, and was buried in the dead of night outside the main gate of the fort while the enemy were firing all round."

It was two months later when General Gatacre read a funeral service over his grave, and Major Aylmer, R.E., "erected a tombstone to his memory, and with his own hands carved an inscription upon it." Here we may not unfittingly add Captain Younghusband's testimony to the living in a different rank:

"After poor Baird I think the subject on which the officers of the garrison spoke most feelingly was the devotion and noble spirit of discipline and determination shown by the Sikhs. There were but a hundred of them in a garrison of nearly four hundred; but the officers said without them they could never have held out, and that but for these Sikhs not one of them would have been there now."

Much more in detail will be read in the book—where is also a very successful photographic picture of the "Company of the 14th Sikhs," which is good to see.

It would be out of question for us to venture a single criticism on the military incidents of the campaign. But the bravest soldier may still doubt whether it was wise on March 2nd to send out "a reconnoitring force," consisting of so large

INSECT BITES OR STINGS, CHAFED SKIN, PILES, CUTS, SORE EYES, SUNBURN, EARACHE, NEURALGIC AND RHEUMATIC PAINS, THROAT COLDS, AND SKIN AILMENTS, QUICKLY RELIEVED BY USE OF

CALVERT'S CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp, and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

a portion of the garrison, when hostilities between the British and the Chitralis had not yet commenced. Far be it from us to undervalue the judgment of Surgeon-Major Robertson and his commandant, Captain Colin Campbell; but surely there was lack of adequate information as to the enemy's position, and utter disaster was only averted by Lieutenant Harley and his fifty Sikhs' gallant and successful covering of the retreat. The description of that offensive and defensive engagement (p.100-8) is one of the best in the book, comprising as it does the thrilling incident of Dr. Whitchurch's noble rescue of the mortally wounded Baird. But, after all, it reminds one of the disastrous results—on a larger field—of the sorties from Agra and Lucknow in the great revolt, which, in each case, brought on close investment, as happened in the case of Chitral.

The gallant authors have no responsibility for the ugly business of which the beleaguerment of a British Indian officer, beyond the Himalaya, became so striking a demonstration. The reckless policy, of which this was one inevitable result, began long before they came on the scene. Yet as the final chapter of the book, "The Present Situation," gives a sort of challenge, it must be noticed. The line taken in the plea on behalf of the retention of Chitral proceeds on the usual fallacy—here we are, what else can we do? This question must, by men with a due sense of responsibility, be answered by another—how, and why did the Indian Government get itself into that false position? That question, one that is equivalent to an indictment, has been answered in every shape and form in former issues of this journal. It is idle for those whose advice or weak concurrence has plunged the Indian Empire into interminable difficulties, far beyond its frontiers, to try to excuse themselves by the existence of the difficulties they have themselves created. There is no fatality in the situation, save the semblance thereof, which they have wantonly incurred and evoked. It is vain for them to be constantly and cunningly begging the question; for, though current Indian history is systematically obscured by persistent sequestration of State papers and dexterous evasion of personal responsibility, the truth must come out. The only safe and conservative course, consistently followed under the Governor-Generals from Canning to Mayo and Northbrook, has been abundantly vindicated in its wisdom by the catastrophes, the confusion, and the intolerable waste of Indian resources that have followed from its violation. All these disastrous results that have followed, of which the siege of Chitral with its costly campaign form a striking object lesson, confirm to the very letter every warning, every prediction recorded during the time of the strong men up to 1875, which has been followed, to the ruin of India, by the *régime* of military adventurers, of sciolists, and fevered strategists.

Two illustrations of the *impasse* into which our Indian Empire has been thrust we may take from this volume. On p. 13 is given a sketch of Umra Khan of Gandul, the "enterprising chief," the "uncontrollable spirit," against whom the Indian Government (ostensibly) organised a huge expedition into the fastnesses of High Asia. But who fed the "ambitions" of this Pathan brigand, and enabled him to pursue this "series of wars against his neighbours (the Amír of Kabul included) which only culminated in the disasters of the present year?" Who, indeed, but the Indian Government itself, alternately commended or weakly deprecated by successive Secretaries of State? More than three years ago ample warning was given in these columns of the mischief being wrought by this marauding chief whom the Simla Foreign Office used as its catspaw and congenial instrument. But our few independent public men were too busy to attend to the real dangers of the Indian Empire. The other illustration we take from the volume is the map which shows, in little, (*a*) the true statutory boundary of India, and (*b*) the immense tract of barren mountains which the Indian Government vainly affects to bring under its "Political Control," at a cost to India in revenues, credit, and reputation which no one in England has yet realised.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

DECEMBER, 1895.

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). The Editor, "Girls' Schools in the Madras Presidency." Irvine, W., "Sir Robert Sandeman and the Indian Frontier." "The Mysore State."

NINETEENTH CENTURY. Griffin, Sir Lepel, "Kashmir."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

DECEMBER, 1895.

"RAM BUX"........."Boojum Ballads." (Nutt) Paper	Rs. 2.8
ANSON, BREVET-MAJOR O. H. S. G. ...."With H. M. 9th Lancers during the Indian Mutiny." (W. H. Allen)	7s. 6d.
ALI, SYED AMEER, C.I.E. ...."The Spirit of Islam; or the Life and Teachings of Muhammad." (W. H. Allen & Co.)..........	12s. 0d.
McMILLAN, ALEC ...."Divers Ditties, chiefly written in India." (Constable)	
WILSON, SIR ROLAND KNYVET, L.L.M. .... "A Digest of Anglo-Muhammadan Law." (Thacker & Co.)	— —
GORE, F. St. J. ...."Lights and Shades of Hill Life in the Afghan and Hindu Highlands of the Punjab." (John Murray)	31s. 6d.
ROY, SUNDARI BULA............."Acwamedha and and Acramavisika Parva." (Bhârata Press, Calcutta)	— —
JOHNSTONE, MAJOR-GENERAL SIR JAMES, K.C.S.I. .. "My Experiences in Manipur and the Naga Hills." (Sampson Low)	— —
McCORMICK, A. D. ...."An Artist in the Himalayas." (Fisher Unwin)	16s. 0d.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—

India: Final Examination—September, 1895	1s. 0d.
India, Civil Service of, and Clerkships, Class I, August, 1895........................	1s. 0d.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.